



Cognizability of the world and its patterns

All-Union Society for the dissemination of
political and scientific knowledge

Knowledge Publishing House. Moscow. 1953

Svitlana M
Erdogan A

Cognizability of the world and its regularities

K. Ya. Andreev

Publishing House Knowledge.

Moscow. 1953

Translation From Russian Source: All-Union Society for the dissemination of political and scientific knowledge.

Publishing House Knowledge. Moscow. 1953

K. Ya. Andreev

Index

Introduction -**P4**

The fundamental opposite of materialism and idealism in resolving the question of the cognizability of the world- **P11**

Dialectical materialism about the process of cognition.

The initial stage of knowledge -**P22**

Abstract thinking is the highest stage of the process of cognition- **P27**

The role of language in cognition- **P35**

Classics of Marxism-Leninism on practice as the basis of knowledge- **P44**

The Objective Character of Truth- **P54**

On Absolute and Relative Truth- **P62**

Practice as a criterion of truth – **P80**

Significance of the Marxist-Leninist position on the cognizability of the world for the practical activities of the Communist Party – **P92**

Introduction

The emergence of Marxism marks the greatest discovery, a real revolution in philosophy. The world-historical merit of Marx and Engels lies primarily in the fact that for the first time in the history of social thought they created a harmonious, uniquely scientific world outlook of the proletariat—dialectical materialism. Having deeply studied all the previous materialist philosophy, Marx and Engels freed the old materialism from metaphysics, enriched it with the scientific dialectical method, developed it further, extending it to the field of social phenomena. The philosophy of the proletariat they created was a qualitatively new philosophical system, radically different from all previous, even progressive, philosophical systems.

Under the new historical conditions of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the great leaders of the proletariat Lenin and Stalin creatively developed dialectical materialism further, enriching it with new propositions and conclusions arising from the new practice of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and its party.

The greatest theoretical result of the vast experience accumulated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet state and the world revolutionary movement are the works of Comrade Stalin "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism", "Marxism and Questions of Linguistics" and "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

In these works, Comrade Stalin advanced far ahead the development of all fundamental questions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, gave deep and exhaustive answers to the vital questions that confronted us in the course of building socialism

and communism in the USSR and the revolutionary struggle of the working people of the whole world, shed a powerful light on Marxist-Leninist science. development of all social and natural sciences, ideologically armed the Communist Party and the Soviet people in the struggle for the triumph of communism.

Raised to an unattainable height in the works of Comrade Stalin, dialectical materialism equips us with the only scientific method for cognizing and transforming the reality around us.

Comrade Stalin points out that the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party "is called dialectical materialism because its approach to natural phenomena, its method of studying natural phenomena, its method of knowing these phenomena is dialectical, and its interpretation of natural phenomena, its understanding of natural phenomena, its theory - materialistic. (Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 535. 11th ed.)

In his work On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, Comrade Stalin, for the first time in the history of Marxism, set forth in a systematic, coherent form the main features of the Marxist dialectical method and Marxist philosophical materialism, clearly showed their greatest significance for the practical activity of the proletariat and its party.

Revealing the radical opposition of idealism to Marxist philosophical materialism and characterizing the first feature of Marxist philosophical materialism, Comrade Stalin points out:

“... Marx’s philosophical materialism proceeds from the fact that the world is material in nature, that the diverse phenomena in the world represent different types of

moving matter, that mutual the connection and mutual conditioning of phenomena, established by the dialectical method, represent the laws of development of moving matter, that the world develops according to the laws of motion of matter and does not need any "world spirit". (Ibid., p. 541.)

This most important proposition of Marxist philosophical materialism, fully substantiated by Comrade Stalin, is of exceptional importance. It utterly shatters the ravings of idealism that the world is supposedly the embodiment of an "absolute idea", "world spirit", "consciousness", that the unity of the world supposedly consists not in its materiality, but in its "spirituality".

All the achievements of science and especially natural science irrefutably testify that everything around us is nothing but various types of eternally moving matter, that no supernatural, spiritual, non-material world has ever existed and does not exist, that nature, matter, by no one and nothing created, but exists forever, turning from one state to another.

But if there is nothing in the world but eternally moving matter, then how can we explain the appearance of our thoughts, consciousness, what is their relationship to the world around us?

The only correct, scientific answer to this question is given by Marxist philosophical materialism. Describing the second feature of Marxist philosophical materialism, Comrade Stalin writes:

“In contrast to idealism, which asserts that only our consciousness really exists, that the material world, being, nature exists only in our consciousness, in our sensations, ideas, concepts, Marxist philosophical materialism proceeds from the fact that matter, nature, being represents objective reality that exists outside and independently of consciousness, that matter is primary, since it is a source of sensations, ideas, consciousness, and consciousness is secondary, derivative, since it is a reflection of matter, a reflection of being, that thinking is a product of matter that has reached in its the development of a high degree of perfection, namely, the product of the brain, and the brain is the organ of thinking, that it is therefore impossible to separate thinking from matter without wanting to fall into a gross error. (I. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 542.)

In this classical formulation, Comrade Stalin showed that it is not the consciousness of people that gives rise to the material world around us, but, on the contrary, matter, existing outside of us and independently of us, gives rise to our ideas, consciousness, thinking, that our thoughts, ideas, consciousness are nothing. other than the reflection in the human brain of objects, phenomena of the material world.

The question of the relation of thinking to being, consciousness to matter, was called by the classics of Marxism-Leninism the main, basic question of philosophy. Philosophers of all times and peoples are divided into two opposite camps fighting among themselves according to how they answered this question. Those philosophers who believed that spirit, consciousness, thinking are primary and who ultimately

recognized the creation of the world, formed the camp of idealism. The same philosophers who believed that the main principle is the material world around us, nature, formed the camp of materialism.

Reactionary philosophers have always tried to bypass the solution of the fundamental question of philosophy, to reconcile materialism and idealism, to hide the reactionary idealist essence of their worldview, but nothing came of this except confusion, sophistry, and charlatanism. Whatever self-contained "isms" hide the numerous "schools" and "trends" of modern bourgeois American-English philosophy, they express the same reactionary essence, belong to the same camp, for they all solve the basic question of philosophy idealistically.

But the basic question of philosophy also has another side:

“... how do our thoughts about the world around us relate to this world itself? Is our thinking able to cognize the real world, can we, in our ideas and concepts of the real world, constitute a true reflection of reality? (K. Marx, F. Engels. Selected works, vol. II, p. 351. Gospolitizdat. 1952.)

Idealists could not give a scientifically sound answer to this question. As a rule, they always reflected the ideology of the reactionary, moribund classes, not interested in the true knowledge of the world, with the aim of its revolutionary transformation. Therefore, idealists of all varieties in one form or another, openly or disguisedly, but in essence, always denied the possibility of reliable knowledge of the reality surrounding us by a person.

The only scientific and exhaustively substantiated answer to the question of the knowability of the world is contained in the third feature of Marxist philosophical materialism. Comrade Stalin formulates it as follows:

“In contrast to idealism, which disputes the possibility of knowing the world and its laws, does not believe in the reliability of our knowledge, does not recognize objective truth, and believes that the world is full of “things in themselves” that can never be known by science—Marxist philosophical materialism proceeds from the fact that the world and its laws are completely cognizable, that our knowledge of the laws of nature, verified by experience, practice, is reliable knowledge that has the value of objective truths, that there are no unknowable things in the world, but only things that have not yet been known, which will be revealed and known by the forces of science and practice. (I. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 543.)

The entire history of the development of scientific knowledge irrefutably proves the truth of this most important proposition of dialectical materialism. Each new discovery in science shows that a person goes from ignorance to knowledge, unknown and unknown phenomena become known and known, that there is no such mystery in the world around us that a person is not able to unravel and cognize.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism not only comprehensively and exhaustively proved the possibility of knowing the world and its laws, but indicated the only correct method, ways and means of this knowledge. Having created the theory of cognition of dialectical materialism, they armed humanity with

the dialectical method of cognition, with the help of which people discover the most secret secrets of the reality around us.

Summarizing the latest achievements of science and social practice, Comrade Stalin tirelessly developed and enriched this theory. The greatest contributions to the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge are the works of Comrade Stalin "Marxism and Questions of Linguistics" and "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR".

In the work Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, such fundamental questions of Marxist epistemology as the connection between language and thinking, the significance of abstract thinking in the process of cognition, the question of the concreteness of truth, the source of cognition, the role of free exchange of opinions in the process of cognition and other.

In his work The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, Comrade Stalin deeply creatively develops and develops further such important questions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge as the objective nature of the laws of nature and human society, the concreteness of truth, the unity of science and practice, the significance of studying the deep forces that determine the course of events, and many others. In this work, I. V. Stalin mercilessly criticized the anti-Marxist subjective-idealist point of view on the nature of the laws governing the development of nature and society.

This brochure is devoted to the study of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the cognizability of the world and its laws, of the ways and means of cognizing the reality around us.

The fundamental opposite of materialism and idealism in resolving the question of the cognizability of the world

The question of the cognizability of the world in a primitive form arose at the earliest stages of the development of human society. Already primitive man tried to find answers to the questions: what the world is, what forces govern the world, whether it develops according to the laws inherent in it, or is it controlled by the activity of unknown supernatural forces, what is the reason for the onset of various natural phenomena, etc. It is clear that At that time, a person could not get scientifically substantiated answers to these questions and often had to fantasize, resort to explaining natural phenomena to a special divine power invented by him, which was subsequently used by the ideologists of the exploiting classes, fixing this fantastic, distorted idea of the reality around us in various religious-idealistic philosophical systems.

But even then, attempts were made to explain natural phenomena, that is, to consider the world as it really is. These attempts at a naïve, but, in essence, correct approach to the study of nature come out with particular clarity in ancient materialistic philosophy, which was born and developed in the fiercest struggle against idealism.

The struggle between materialism and idealism in ancient Greece, as in the entire subsequent history of philosophy, was waged not only around the fundamental question of philosophy—the relation of thought to being—but also around the second side of the fundamental question—about the cognizability of the world, i.e., about how whether human thinking is able to correctly reflect, cognize, reveal the essence of things and phenomena of the material world.

The idealistic point of view that the world is allegedly fundamentally unknowable by its nature is most frankly preached by skeptics and agnostics, representatives of the exploiting classes who are not interested in knowing the laws of the world. Revealing the essence of agnosticism, V. I. Lenin wrote:

“Agnostic is a Greek word: “a” means “not” in Greek; gnosis - knowledge. The agnostic says: I don’t know if there is an objective reality that is reflected, reflected by our sensations, I declare it impossible to know this... Hence the denial of objective truth by the agnostic and tolerance, petty-bourgeois, philistine, cowardly tolerance for the doctrine of goblin, brownies, Catholic saints, and the like, things like that.” (V. I. Lenin. Soch., vol. 14, p. 115. 4th ed.)

Agnostics are pessimistic in their approach to assessing human knowledge and do not believe in the reliability of scientific data. We are given only our subjective experiences, they say, and therefore it is impossible even to determine whether the world around us exists or not.

Agnosticism, as a reflection of this degeneration, became widespread already in ancient Greece, especially during the period of the degeneration of ancient philosophy. Philosophers such as Pyrrho, Protagoras, Gorgias, Sextus Empiricus, and others openly asserted the impossibility of knowing the world around us. All knowledge, said, for example, Protagoras, is only an opinion, which means that there is nothing false, just as there is nothing true. As it seems to anyone, it really is: “man,” he said, “is the measure of all things.”

In modern times, a prominent representative of skepticism and agnosticism (since skepticism, as a theory of knowledge, coincides with agnosticism) was the eighteenth-century English idealist philosopher David Hume. All scientific knowledge, all the laws of nature, according to Hume, are the order to which people get used. Hume does not even try to explore what lies beyond our sensations, considering the elucidation of this problem beyond human strength.

Being an expression of the interests of the moribund reactionary classes, Hume's philosophy puts faith and intuition in the place of science. Another representative of agnosticism, Kant, explicitly states that he restricts science in order to leave room for religion.

Unlike Hume, Kant recognized the existence of an objective world of "things in themselves", but declared them unknowable. The objects and phenomena of the reality around us were attributed by Kant to the area of the "other world", inaccessible to knowledge and discovered by faith.

But not all idealists openly recognized the impossibility of knowing the world—the groundlessness of the arguments of the agnostics was too obvious. Many idealists, such as Hegel, were ready to formally admit that the "mind" (or "spirit"), which creates the world, is capable of knowing its work. However, this does not stop idealists from being agnostics, because, in their opinion, a person can cognize not the phenomena of the surrounding reality, but only his subjective ideas or the objective "world spirit", "mind".

Agnosticism in one form or another is inherent in all modern idealistic philosophical systems. By declaring all our

knowledge to be mere subjective perceptions, allegedly not reflecting the real content of the world, they undermine the foundations of science, revive religion and priesthood, doom humanity to passivity and inaction, and distract the working masses from the struggle to change the world. If the world is unknowable, bourgeois philosophers say, then the phenomena of social life are also unknowable, and without knowing the laws of social development, a person cannot change the existing social system, therefore, the working masses are left to come to terms with capitalist exploitation and wait for the help of an unknown divine force that would change their fate. Such is the reactionary class-Party content of any and, above all, modern idealism.

That is why modern, primarily American-British monopolists, the instigators of the third world war, instead of genuine science with great zeal for their class-exploitative purposes, use various reactionary, idealistic pseudo-scientific "theories" - racism, cosmopolitanism, social Darwinism, Weismannism-Morganism, the "theories" of right-wing socialists about the "harmony" of the class interests of the proletarians and capitalists, and similar ravings of certified lackeys of bourgeois science.

The ideologists of US-British imperialism are well aware that genuine science and reason are the strongest weapons of the working people in the struggle against imperialism. Therefore, they are trying in every possible way to discredit science, to prove its impotence to cognize the world around them, they seek to replace it with a religion that calls on the exploited to humbly submit to the exploiters.

The American-British obscurantists see the "excessive" growth of science and technology as the source of all the horrors of modern imperialism. That is why bourgeois philosophers like Carnap propose erasing the very word "truth" from the philosophical vocabulary, and a French journal published an article in which it screams hysterically that "the time has come to hang the scientists." More and more books appear in America that prove the connection between philosophy and religion. Particularly active "activity" in this field is shown by American personalists (Personalism is a reactionary philosophical trend that recognizes the divine, spiritual personality, person as the fundamental principle of being) Royce, Brown, Fluwelling, Brightman, and others who openly preach fideism and clericalism. Thus, Fluwelling assures that "matter exists as a result of the action of an expedient will and a higher power ... god, a higher personality, the true secret of the world order." Another personalist, Brightman, defining the essence of his philosophy, writes: "Personalism is the belief that the universe is a society of conscious beings, that the energy described by physicists is God's will in action. All that is the conscious spirit, or some phase or aspect of the conscious spirit."

Not lagging behind their American masters and English obscurantists, one English mathematician Whittaker authored a book called "Space and Spirit. The theory of the universe and the proof of the existence of God.

Such literature, from which the darkness of the Middle Ages emanates, is now flooding all the countries of the American-British reactionary bloc. The resolute rejection of scientific knowledge of the world, the open preaching of fideism and priestism is a clear indicator of the degradation and disintegration of modern bourgeois science and philosophy, an

indicator of the ultimate fall, insanity, and parasitism of the entire system of modern imperialism.

Throughout its centuries-long history, materialism has waged the most resolute and merciless struggle against agnosticism, against idealism. The history of the development of materialistic thought, as A. A. Zhdanov pointed out, is essentially the history of its struggle with idealism. In this continuous struggle, materialism was tempered, tested, and improved its theory of knowledge.

Even the ancient Greek materialists Democritus, Xenophanes, Parmenides, and others criticized skepticism. Acting as naive realists, the first ancient materialist philosophers did not question the ability of a person to know the world with the help of his sensory perceptions and reason, defended and substantiated the objective truth of human knowledge. A powerful blow to agnosticism was dealt by the metaphysical, mechanistic materialism of the 17th-18th centuries. It was a philosophical expression of the interests of the young emerging bourgeois class and marked a progressive stage in the development of materialism.

Representatives of the materialism of the 17th century Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, the French materialists of the 18th century Diderot, Holbach, Helvetius, Robinet, Lamettry, the German materialist philosopher of the 19th century Ludwig Feuerbach and others also criticized agnosticism, idealism in the theory of knowledge, argued that man is able to know the world around us, is able to reveal the secrets of nature. Considering that the world exists independently of people and that all our knowledge is a reflection of the objective world in human consciousness, the

materialists of the 17th-18th centuries argued that the true object of knowledge is nature itself, and the main means of knowledge is experience, experiment.

They recognized as the criterion of truth the full correspondence of ideas about things and phenomena of the objective world with the things and phenomena themselves. This correspondence, in their opinion, can be established by experience; All knowledge must therefore begin with experience, and end with experiment.

Consequently, speaking of the truth of knowledge, the materialists of the 17th-18th centuries turned to practice, to experience, as a means of penetrating "into the very sanctuary of nature" and a support in the struggle against idealism. This, of course, does not mean that they correctly understood the role of practice in the theory of knowledge. The pre-Marxist bourgeois materialists remained contemplative, metaphysical materialists; they did not reach the understanding that the knowledge of the laws of nature and society can be successfully accomplished only in the process of practical activity of social man, aimed at changing nature and society. They were unable to appreciate the great significance of social revolutionary practice as the basis of human knowledge, as a criterion for its truth, and they reduced practice to experience, to experiment.

The historical limitations of the pre-Marxian bourgeois materialists in the theory of knowledge also consisted in the fact that they did not see the active role of thinking both in knowledge and in practical activity. The process of cognition for them was reduced to contemplation, to the passive perception of things and phenomena of the objective world. Truth for most of them is a simple correspondence of our

knowledge to the outside world, and how to prove this correspondence, how to verify the truth of knowledge, they could not scientifically explain.

The outstanding representatives of Russian materialist philosophy of the 19th century—Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky Dobrolyubov—in their philosophical views stood head and shoulders above all pre-Marxist materialism. They wittily ridiculed and mercilessly exposed the reactionary essence of agnostic idealism. In the fiercest struggle against agnosticism, against idealism, they created a scientific theory of knowledge, closely approaching the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism. The classics of Russian philosophy of the 19th century were not contemplative materialists. They not only theoretically recognized the possibility of knowing the world, like their Western European predecessors, but considered knowledge as an effective force capable of illuminating the path to changing the existing reality, they sought to show the Russian people the way out of poverty, fought for the progressive development of society. The classics of Russian materialism of the 19th century sought to connect their philosophical views as closely as possible with reality, science with life, theory with practice.

The classics of materialistic Russian philosophy went further than Western European pre-Marxian materialism in the question of the criterion of truth. They declared that our knowledge can be considered true only when it is tested in practice. Reality, said N. G. Chernyshevsky, can be known only in the process of practical activity, because only it is able to distinguish true knowledge from imaginary ones.

Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov came close to understanding the role of practice as a revolutionary activity of people. However, the Russian materialists of the 19th century could not rise to an understanding of practice as the social production activity of people taking place at a certain stage in the historical development of society, under the conditions of historically established production relations, because, due to the backwardness of economic relations in Russia, they were unable to discover and understand the true laws social development.

* * *

Thus, the question of knowledge of the world did not receive a truly scientific solution in all pre-Marxian philosophy. This is explained primarily by the fact that all bourgeois materialist philosophers before Marx separated the process, knowledge from social practice, from the historically determined social production and political activity of man. Practice was not considered by them as the concrete historical activity of a class-defined person, as the practice of historically defined social classes. All bourgeois philosophers in their views do not go further than the understanding of man only as a biological being, whose entire activity (including thinking) is allegedly determined only by his physical nature, and not by the social relations in which he lives.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that the trouble with pre-Marxian mechanistic materialism was that its representatives did not know how to apply dialectics to the theory of knowledge, and therefore it (the theory of knowledge) remained metaphysical, historically limited. True, the revolutionary democrats, the classics of Russian materialistic thought of the 19th century,

were able to come close to solving the problem of the cognizability of the world. However, they too, not knowing historical materialism, could not solve this problem correctly.

A complete, truly scientific solution to this question became possible only from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, from the standpoint of the working class, for it represents the only consistently revolutionary part of society interested in real knowledge of the world for the purpose of its revolutionary transformation.

Only the creators of dialectical materialism, Marx and Engels, for the first time in the history of science, showed the true essence of human practice as a socio-historical, productive, revolutionary-critical activity of people aimed at the progressive transformation of nature and human society, and thereby correctly posed and scientifically exhaustively resolved the question of the possibility and ways of knowing the truth, having made a whole revolutionary revolution in the theory of knowledge.

Based on the achievements of science and advanced revolutionary practice, the classics of Marxism-Leninism comprehensively substantiated the unlimited possibility of human knowledge of the reality around us, armed humanity with a powerful weapon of knowledge and revolutionary change in nature and society.

The revolutionary teaching of the classics of Marxism on the possibility of knowing the material world, even during the lifetime of Marx and Engels, was subjected to fierce attacks from the reactionary classes. In the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, when the question of overthrowing the

old, capitalist system and creating a new, communist system became a matter of practical activity for the masses, the Marxist theory of knowledge was subjected to even more fierce attacks and distortions by various ideologues of imperialism. Bourgeois philosophy, Lenin pointed out, especially specialized at that time in epistemology.

The greatest world-historical merit of the leaders of the revolution, Lenin, and Stalin, lies in the fact that they not only completely exposed the reactionary, anti-scientific essence of the idealist epistemology of bourgeois philosophers, but subjected the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism to further deep development. Creatively generalizing the latest scientific discoveries and the practice of the revolutionary struggle of the masses, Lenin and Stalin armed the communist and workers' parties of all countries, the working people of the whole world, advanced scientists with a powerful weapon of knowledge of the objective laws of the development of nature and society and their use in the interests of the working people, in the interests of building a new, communist society.

The only scientific Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge instills confidence in the limitless possibility of knowing the world, opens up a huge prospect for the development of advanced science. The clearest proof of this is the rapid gigantic growth of advanced Soviet science.

The following sections of the pamphlet are devoted to the presentation of the main provisions of the Marxist theory of knowledge and its further creative development in the works of V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin.

Dialectical materialism about the process of cognition.

The initial stage of knowledge

The great revolutionary upheaval accomplished by the classics of Marxism-Leninism in the theory of knowledge consists in the fact that for the first time in the history of social thought they showed that knowledge is a dialectical process of reflection of objects and phenomena of the material world in the mind of a person, taking place on the basis of social practice. They proved that knowledge is not an instantaneous reflection, not a dead, immovable imprint, but a complex, contradictory, endless process of human consciousness moving from ignorance to knowledge, from incomplete, inaccurate knowledge to more complete and more accurate knowledge.

The process of human cognition of objective reality, from the point of view of dialectical materialism, consists of two main stages or moments: empirical, i.e., experimental, and rational, i.e., mental.

In the history of philosophy, these moments of cognition were often considered one-sidedly, metaphysically, separated from each other, opposed to each other. Some philosophers - supporters of rationalism (Descartes, Spinoza, etc.) - saw the source of our knowledge mainly in the mental activity of people, in the mind. They recognized only reason, consciousness as real and dependable, and completely ignored the significance of experience, sensory perception in the process of cognition.

The vice of rationalism lies in its ignorance of the position that rational knowledge cannot proceed without sensory

perception. It is completely meaningless to talk about the knowledge of a person deprived of the sense organs with which he communicates with the outside world. Before thinking, it is necessary to obtain material, facts from the surrounding reality, which constitute the source of knowledge.

There was in the history of philosophy another, opposite direction, called empiricism (Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, etc.). Representatives of this trend considered experience as the basis and source of our knowledge and ignored the role of a rational, logical moment in the process of cognition. They did not understand that the material of sensory perception cannot reflect the essence, the inner content of the phenomenon being studied. For a complete and comprehensive study of the phenomena of the material world, it is necessary to subject the material of sensory perception to rational, mental, mental processing, that is, to make a leap from sensations to logical, abstract, rational knowledge. Logical thinking, as we will see below, plays a huge role in cognition, is its most important stage.

Dialectical materialism denies a one-sided approach to the process of cognition, believing that the rational and empirical moments of cognition are dialectically connected with each other, penetrate each other, complement each other in a complex and diverse process of cognition that proceeds on the basis of the socio-historical practice of people.

Describing the dialectical path of cognition of the objectively existing world, V. I. Lenin wrote:

“From living contemplation to abstract thinking and from it to practice - such is the dialectical path of

cognition of truth, cognition of objective reality.”
(Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, pp. 146-147.
Gospolitizdat.)

From this classical position of V. I. Lenin, it first of all follows that the process of cognition begins with a living contemplation, with the perception of things and phenomena of the material world, i.e., with the direct interaction of a person with the studied objects, phenomena with the help of the senses.

Influencing the human senses (sight, hearing, touch, smell, taste), objects of the external world cause various sensations in his mind (sensations of a certain color, shape, hardness, smell, taste, etc.). Sensation is the first sensual image of individual properties of objects or phenomena, resulting from the impact of objects or phenomena on the human senses. “Sensation,” V. I. Lenin points out, “is the result of the impact of an objectively existing thing in itself, outside of us, on our sense organs ...”. (V. I. Lenin. Soch., vol. 14, p. 106.) A person can communicate with the outside world, interact with the objects and phenomena surrounding him only through sensations.

Therefore, sensations are the only source of our knowledge about the reality around us. V. I. Lenin pointed out that we cannot learn anything about any forms of matter, about any forms of movement except through sensations. But with the help of sensations, only individual properties of objects and phenomena are reflected in our consciousness. The whole image of these objects and phenomena is reflected in the minds of people through a higher form of knowledge - through perception.

For example, if we observe a plant, then with the help of the organs of vision we feel the shape, color, size of this plant; with the help of hands we feel the nature of the surface of the stem and leaves, their shape; with the help of smell, we establish the smell of a plant, etc. But all these sensations are perceived by us not in isolation from each other, but as properties of a single object.

Sensations provide material for perceptions. The latter can arise only on the basis of sensations. But perception is not a mechanical sum of sensations, but an integral sensual image of objects, phenomena with the totality of their properties, qualities, aspects reflected in sensations.

The third form of sensory reflection in the human mind of the material world is representation. Representation is a sensual image of those objects and phenomena that we perceived before, but which are not directly perceived at the moment. This is a reproduction in the human mind of those objects and phenomena that influenced our senses, were perceived in the past and remained in our memory. We easily, for example, reproduce in our minds images of people close to us, familiar, previously perceived by us objects, etc.

Representation, as well as sensation and perception, is a sensory image resulting from the impact of things and phenomena on our senses. But this is a higher form of sensory reflection of the material world in the human mind. Representation is not a mechanical imprint of an object, a phenomenon in the human brain, but the result of all the rich experience of past perceptions. Therefore, representations contain elements of generalization.

Sensations, perceptions, and ideas constitute the first and necessary stage of cognition - the stage of direct, living contemplation. Any knowledge begins with the direct interaction of a person with objects of the external world, which takes place in the process of social practice. This interaction can take place only with the help of the sense organs in the form of sensations, perceptions, and ideas. Therefore, sensory knowledge is the direct or indirect source of all human knowledge.

Describing the process of the emergence of thoughts in deaf-mutes and revealing the inseparable connection of these thoughts with objective reality, Comrade Stalin wrote in his work *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*:

everyday life about the objects of the external world and their relationships with each other due to the senses of sight, touch, taste, smell. Outside of these images, perceptions, ideas, thought is empty, devoid of any content whatsoever, that is, it does not exist. (I. Stalin. *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, p. 47. Gospolitizdat 1951.)

This applies not only to the deaf and dumb, but also to all other people who, unlike the deaf and dumb, have not only the organs of sight, touch, taste, smell, but also the organs of hearing. Only thanks to these sense organs can a person communicate with objects, phenomena of the external world, reflect them in his mind, learn their properties, qualities, patterns of their development.

Abstract thinking is the highest stage of the process of cognition

However, the process of cognition cannot be limited only to the sensory level. In order to cognize the objects and phenomena of the world around us in a deeper, fuller, more versatile way, it is necessary to move from the first, sensual stage to the second, most important stage of cognition - to abstract thinking.

By means of sensations, single things are mainly reflected, what lies on the surface of phenomena is clarified. But dialectical materialism is not satisfied with the knowledge of some external aspects, but seeks to penetrate into the essence of the real world, to know more deeply the patterns of development of nature, society, and human thinking, which is completely impossible without theoretical scientific-abstract thinking. Adequate (i.e., identical, mostly accurate), complete reflection of reality occurs in scientific concepts in the process of dialectical thinking on the basis of social practice.

“Knowledge,” Lenin teaches, “is man’s reflection of nature. But this is not a simple, direct, integral reflection, but a process of a series of abstractions, the formation, formation of concepts, laws, etc...”. (V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 156.)

Science is not a simple summary of observations and experiments. Observations and experiments themselves make sense only when they are not done blindly, but are combined with deep scientific and theoretical thinking, when a person, through comparisons, comparisons of things and phenomena, through generalizations, etc., draws conclusions not only about what is directly perceived, but also about what cannot be

directly perceived (for example, the process of formation of heavenly bodies, the process of development of life on earth, etc.).

Logical processing, generalization of facts, results of observations makes it possible to reflect common features, essential properties of objects and phenomena, to penetrate into the depth of the content of facts, to reveal the general, main, essential in a single one.

By the power of sensations alone, a person would not be able to measure the distances between the stars, “weigh” the planets, stars, the Sun, determine their chemical composition, temperature, etc. This became possible thanks to the human mind, thinking.

With our eyes we can see colors, shapes, the external state of an object, with our ears we can hear the sounds emitted by it, with the organs of smell we can smell, etc., but neither with our eyes, nor with our ears, nor with the organs of smell can we directly know the general connections and relationships between things and phenomena of the objective world, because they cannot be perceived sensually. And only ascending to the stage of abstract thinking, we can cognize the real essence of the phenomena around us.

The process of abstract thinking is carried out in three main forms: in the form of concepts, judgments, and conclusions.

A concept is a form of thinking that reflects the most general, most essential, decisive, and necessary properties, signs of real things and phenomena. The concepts do not reflect all the features of objects that are perceived by our senses, but only the

main, essential features. So, for example, in the concept of "man" everything that is common, essential that belongs to all people (for example, the ability to make tools of production) is fixed. Therefore, the concept is devoid of clarity. In the process of forming a concept, we abstract from individual, random, insignificant features of individual objects, and generalize the perceptions, representations of a large number of homogeneous objects, highlight in them what is necessary inherent in them, what constitutes their specificity.

Abstracting from the random, insignificant, individual, we sort of move away from specific things and phenomena, but we make this departure in order to better know. The content of the concept is the material that gives a person perceptions, ideas, that is, in the final analysis, objective reality, human practice. Concepts, says Engels, are "results in which the data of experience are generalized...". (Friedrich Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, p. 14. Gospolitizdat. 1951)

Therefore, the most general concepts are not divorced from reality, from real individual things and phenomena (as the idealists assert), but are most closely connected with them, contain a wealth of special, personal, individual.

Thinking bypasses, omits the unimportant, particular, which belongs to individual objects, but by abstracting (i.e., being distracted) from details, we get the opportunity to know specific objects more fully, deeper, and more versatile. "Thinking," writes V. I. Lenin, "ascending from the concrete to the abstract, does not deviate – if it is correct ... from the truth, but approaches it ... all scientific (correct, serious, not absurd) abstractions reflect nature deeper, or rather, fuller. (V. I. Lenin. *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 146.)

Concepts enable us to orientate ourselves correctly in specific conditions, to correctly understand and evaluate individual events, to generalize concrete facts, the experience of people, the practice of the revolutionary activity of the masses, and allow us to build scientific foresight.

Therefore, concepts play a huge role in scientific research. Each science develops a certain system of concepts in which all the richness of our knowledge is generalized and concentrated.

But before composing a scientific concept about a particular subject, people go a long way in studying this subject. First, people learn about the most simple, superficial properties of an object. But in the process of further study, more and more profound, hidden, internal properties, features of the subject being studied are comprehended. As individual properties and features of an object are revealed, we make a judgment about this object.

Judgment is a reflection in the mind of a person of any sign, property, feature of an object. In *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels vividly showed how, in the process of deepening knowledge, there is a process of improvement, a deepening of our judgments about the objects of the objective world. Even prehistoric people knew, Engels points out, that friction produces heat, but many millennia passed before people could express the judgment: "friction is a source of heat." New millennia passed, and people in the process of further studying the essence of movement formulated a new, deeper judgment: "any mechanical movement is capable of turning into heat through friction." And only in the middle of XIX century, when science and social practice took a step forward in their development, people got the opportunity to formulate a

judgment that is a universal law of motion: "any form of motion is capable of transforming into any other form of motion."

So the change, the deepening of our knowledge is accompanied by the improvement and deepening of people's judgments about objects, phenomena of the material world.

Judgment is one of the basic and most important forms of thinking. Judgments reflect the objective connection of objects and phenomena, their internal content, and patterns of development. Every law of the objective world, every scientific proposition is expressed in the form of a definite judgment.

Inference plays a particularly important role in the process of logical thinking.

Inference is such a mental act in which a new judgment about things and phenomena of the objective world is derived from true judgments. Without the help of inferences, people cannot cognize phenomena and processes that are not directly perceived by the senses. People, for example, cannot directly see the shape of the Earth, but they know that it is approximately spherical. People came to this conclusion due to the correct connection, for example, such true judgments: "all spherical bodies always cast a shadow in the form of a disk" and "The Earth during lunar eclipses always casts a shadow in the form of a disk." Hence the conclusion follows: "The earth has the shape of a ball."

Correct inferences must satisfy two basic conditions: firstly, the judgments (premisses) from which the inference is derived must be true, i.e., correspond to reality, and, secondly, the connection of these judgments (premises) in the inference

must be logical correct in form. Elementary laws and forms of the correct construction of judgments in inference are studied by formal logic.

Thus, abstract thinking in the form of concepts, judgments and conclusions gives us the opportunity to cognize the objective world more fully and deeply, to reveal the most important, essential aspects, connections, and patterns of reality, which is why it represents the most important, highest stage of human cognition of the objective world.

The socio-historical activity of people can be strengthened, deepened, and expanded thanks to theoretical thinking, thanks to the strengthening, deepening and development of scientific thought, and the theory, in turn, is verified and supplemented in the process of socio-historical practice of people.

"... When analyzing economic forms," Marx wrote, "neither a microscope nor chemical reagents can be used. Both must be replaced by the power of abstraction. (K. Marx, F. Engels. Selected works, vol. I, p. 409.)

V. I. Lenin wrote on this issue:

"Representation ... does not grasp movement at a speed of 300,000 km per second, but thinking grasps and must grasp." (V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 199.)

The idea is powerless to reflect the process of transformation of a seed into a plant, the process of plant growth, the process of evolutionary development of animals and plants that took place over many millennia, etc. This can encompass and reflect human thinking.

In the process of thinking, a person compares and synthesizes the theoretical and practical experience of past generations (reflected and enshrined in the laws of science, concepts, logical categories) and the practice of people of the present. By illuminating practice with the help of theory and taking into account its new data, advanced scientists develop the theory itself further. This, in turn, allows theoretical thinking to anticipate the facts, to get ahead of practice, and on this basis to put forward scientific hypotheses, to build scientific foresight.

Engels said that ants have more perfect vision than humans - they can even see chemical light rays. But man, not seeing these rays, managed to detect and cognize them. The very fact that it is possible to prove that ants see rays that are invisible to us is a clear indication that a certain device of our vision is not an absolute limit for human knowledge. Other sense organs join our eye, and most importantly, thinking.

Substantiating the inextricable link between thinking and language and revealing the enormous role of language in the practical and cognitive activity of people, I. V. Stalin in his work "Marxism and questions of linguistics" deeply revealed the abstracting activity of human thinking, vividly showed the greatest importance of scientific abstractions.

"Grammar," teaches Comrade Stalin, "is the result of a long, abstract work of human thinking, an indicator of the enormous success of thinking." (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 24.)

Characterizing the specific features of grammar and exposing the Marrovites, who belittled the abstracting activity of human

thinking, I. V. Stalin deeply reveals the enormous role of scientific abstractions, shows the decisive importance of the ability of human thought to abstract from the particular and the concrete in order to cognize the general, essential, fundamental in material phenomena. peace.

These provisions of Comrade Stalin make a new contribution to the substantiation and development of the Marxist position on the significance of abstract thinking in the cognitive and practical activities of people.

The role of language in cognition

The enormous role of language in the process of cognition is determined by its inseparable connection with thinking. Various idealistic primary and secondary schools often resorted to a distorted, anti-scientific interpretation of the history of the development of language in order to tear it away from thinking, to oppose language and thinking to the social, industrial, and political activities of people, to separate them from the theory of knowledge, from the history of the development of human society. The Marrovites also took the same path. They argued that language was allegedly not connected with thinking, that humanity could supposedly do without language. "... Tearing thinking away from language and "liberating" it from linguistic "natural matter," writes I. V. Stalin in his work "Marxism and Questions of Linguistics," N. Ya. Marr falls into the swamp of idealism. (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 39.)

Exposing the Marrovites, I. V. Stalin proved that language is organically connected with thinking, constitutes an inseparable whole with it, that communication between people can be carried out only with the help of thinking, connected with language as with its own form. But if thinking cannot proceed in isolation from its material linguistic form, then it follows that language plays an exceptional role in man's cognition of objective reality, for abstract thinking, as we have seen, is the highest step in the process of cognition.

It is known that even Marx and Engels pointed to the exceptionally important role of language in the development of human thinking, in the formation and improvement of people's cognitive activity. They emphasized that the emergence and

development of language has always been closely connected with thinking. The formation and improvement of thinking and language took place simultaneously in the process of social and labor production activities of people.

"First, labor," wrote F. Engels in his work "The Role of Labor in the Process of the Transformation of Ape into Man," "and then, together with it, articulate speech were the two most important stimuli, under the influence of which the brain of a monkey gradually turned into a human brain ... ". (Friedrich Engels. *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 135. Gospolitizdat. 1952.)

Emphasizing the inextricable link between language and thinking, with human consciousness, Marx and Engels wrote in *The German Ideology*: "Language is as ancient as consciousness; Language is just a practical consciousness that exists also for other people, and only thereby also exists for me, a real consciousness, and, like consciousness, language arises only from a need, from an urgent need to communicate with other people. (K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, vol. IV, pp. 20-21.).

In "Anti-Dühring" F. Engels exposes the metaphysician Dühring, who, separating abstract thinking from speech, argued that "he who is able to think only through speech has never yet experienced what abstract and genuine thinking means." "If so," Engels replies, "then animals turn out to be the most abstract and genuine thinkers since their thinking is never obscured by the importunate intervention of speech." (Friedrich Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, p. 79.)

Following Marx and Engels, V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin also highly appreciated the role of language in human cognitive

activity. In the "Philosophical Notebooks" V. I. Lenin directly points to the need to study the history of language and thinking in order to learn to better understand the world.

Generalizing the latest achievements of advanced science and revolutionary practice, I. V. Stalin, with the utmost depth and clarity, developed the problem of the relationship between language and thinking in his work "Marxism and Questions of Linguistics", convincingly proved the decisive role of their unity in the process of cognition.

"They say," writes I. V. Stalin, "that thoughts arise in a person's head before they are expressed in speech, they arise without linguistic material, without a linguistic shell, so to speak, in a naked form. But this is completely false. Whatever thoughts arise in a person's head and whenever they arise, they can arise and exist only on the basis of linguistic material, on the basis of linguistic terms and phrases. Bare thoughts, free from linguistic material, free from linguistic "natural matter" - do not exist. "Language is the immediate reality of thought" (Marx). The reality of thought is manifested in language. Only idealists can talk about thinking that is not connected with the "natural matter" of language, about thinking without language. (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 39.)

The idealistic separation of thinking from language inevitably leads to a perverse, anti-scientific explanation of the very essence of both language and thinking, to the recognition of the so-called "pure thinking", torn off from the material linguistic shell.

JV Stalin showed the importance of language as the most important means of communication between people, showed

the enormous role of language in the process of man's cognition of objective reality.

"Language is a means," writes I. V. Stalin, "a tool with which people communicate with each other, exchange thoughts and achieve mutual understanding. Being directly connected with thinking, language registers and consolidates in words and in the combination of words in sentences the results of the work of thinking, the successes of human cognitive work, and thus makes it possible to exchange thoughts in human society. (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 22.)

These instructions of JV Stalin are of exceptional importance for the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge. They show that only with the help of language, that is, with the help of words, sentences, terms, etc., is it possible to reflect things and phenomena of the objective world in the human mind. Only with the help of language does a person express and consolidate the results of his cognitive activity, clothing human thoughts in a material linguistic shell. Whatever thought arises in a person's head, it cannot but be formulated in words. When we try to clarify our thoughts even for ourselves, we try in our minds to pick up such words and expressions that would express our thoughts as accurately as possible, the connection of some thoughts with others, the transition from one thought to another, etc. Thoughts become reality as for thinking, and for other people only then, when we clothe the content of our thoughts in a linguistic form, in a material verbal shell. "... A thought only then becomes a thought," wrote M.I. Kalinin, "when it is expressed in speech, when it comes out through the language, when it—as philosophers would say—is mediated and objectified for others." (M.I. Kalinin. On communist education, p. 98. Publishing house "Young Guard". 1946) .

Therefore, language and thinking are interconnected as form and content, and it is impossible to separate them from each other, just as it is impossible to separate form from content in general, because objective reality does not know formless content, as well as contentless form.

Being a form of expression of our thoughts, language at the same time serves as the most important means of transmitting these thoughts to other people, makes it possible to consolidate and store the knowledge acquired by people. Without speaking, a person would not be able to transfer his thoughts, accumulated knowledge, and practical experience to other people, because the exchange of thoughts between people can occur only with the help of language.

A person could not use the knowledge not only of previous generations, but also of his contemporaries. Each individual would have to begin the knowledge of the objective world from the beginning, and no science would be possible. Only with the help of oral and written speech do people pass on from generation to generation continuously accumulating knowledge and thus move science forward. Thanks to this, as Engels pointed out, people do not need "that every single individual should personally experience everything in his own experience; his individual experience may, to a certain extent, be replaced by the results of the experience of a number of his ancestors. If, for example, in our country the mathematical axioms are presented to every eight-year-old child as something taken for granted, not in need of any experimental proof, then this is only the result of "accumulated heredity."(Friedrich Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, p. 350). And this "accumulated heredity" can be consolidated, developed, and transmitted only with the help of oral and written speech,

without which we could not use all the wealth that humanity has developed throughout its history.

“The study of native speech,” wrote M. I. Kalinin, addressing the youth, “is a great thing. The highest achievements of human thought, the deepest knowledge and the most ardent feelings will remain unknown to people if they are not clearly and accurately formulated in words. (M. I. Kalinin. On communist education, p. 98.)

By exchanging thoughts, people not only pass on the knowledge they have achieved to each other, but also get the opportunity to use this knowledge for joint actions in the fight against the forces of nature, for subordinating them to the interests of people, for the collective production of material goods, for the revolutionary transformation of social life.

Language also plays a huge role in the very process of cognition, since only language, with the help of words and sentences, can express and consolidate thoughts in the minds of people, the success of human cognitive activity, because “ideas,” as Marx wrote, “do not exist apart from language.” (Archive of Marx and Engels, vol. IV, p. 99. Partizdat, 1935.)

Therefore, language is a constant companion of man in the entire complex and diverse process of cognition from living contemplation to abstract thinking and from abstract thinking to practice.

A particularly important role belongs to language in the transition of human cognition from direct perceptions, sensations, ideas to abstract thinking in the form of logical categories and in the process of abstract thinking itself. It is at

this stage of the process of cognition of the objective world that new thoughts, ideas, discoveries arise in the human mind, which are clothed in the appropriate linguistic form. Only a highly developed flexible language with a rich vocabulary can ensure the flexibility of thinking, enable it to reflect the diversity of the world, the most complex relationships and connections between things and phenomena of reality.

A completely opposite point of view on this issue is preached by modern American-English idealist philosophers. In an effort to "substantiate" the idealistic interpretation of the essence of thinking at all costs, such philosophizing obscurantists as Russell, Carnap, Whitehead, and others declare without proof that language is allegedly incapable of correctly conveying human thoughts, that speech can allegedly only distort the true content of thoughts. They therefore propose to reform language, free it from the material shell of language, or, as they say, from "false metaphysics", that is, from materialism, and consider "pure" thinking, without the intervention of language. "Logic," says Russell, "that trusts language in the slightest degree, leads to false metaphysics." Eaton, professor at Harvard University, echoes him: "Whoever follows the mere grammar of a language," he says, "will not come from the correct premises to the correct conclusions."

The class-political essence of modern idealistic distortions in the grammar of language and the logic of thought is especially clearly visible in the reactionary, so-called semantic bourgeois philosophy.

The "imperfection of the language", "the insufficiency of its syntactic structure", says the representative of this trend in

bourgeois philosophy, Carnap, is the cause of all earthly evils, social unrest, and scientific errors.

If people could establish the correct construction of speech, eliminate the "inaccuracy" of words and expressions, then in the world, in his opinion, universal peace and harmony would reign. He proposes, therefore, to restructure both the form of language and the form of thought.

Throwing dust in the eyes with "democratic" phraseology about freedom, Carnap proclaims the "principle of tolerance", according to which there is no morality in logic and language, there are no laws and forms binding on all people; everyone is free to create for himself his own language, his own logic, in which he can "arbitrarily choose any axioms and rules of inference."

"The reason why people still do not dare to go further from the classical form," states Carnap, "lies, of course, in the widespread point of view that deviations must be "justified", i.e., to prove that the new form of language " correct" that it conveys "true logic".

And Carnap laments that "the first attempts to free the ship of logic from the solid shore of the classical form were crushed by the desire for "truth". Now, at last, this obstacle has been overcome: before us lies an open ocean of free possibilities.

Assessing the verbiage of American semantics, one Dutch progressive wrote in the journal *Politics and Culture*: "The purpose of all these 'theories' is clear. This is a desire to destroy national languages, to inspire the idea of the inevitability of the gradual replacement of national languages by English, of the

inevitability of the transformation of the Yankee language into a world language. ("Literaturnaya Gazeta" dated June 21, 1952.27)

The true meaning of all linguistic and logical tricks of the Anglo-American semantics is quite obvious. In every possible way belittling the importance of language, they treat first of all the languages of freedom-loving peoples. They needed this in order to "prove" the superiority of the English language over all other languages of the world, the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race over other races, in order to destroy national languages, to impose the English language, the Anglo-American "way of life" on other peoples.

Thus, the American-English reactionary semantic philosophy, preaching the need for a reform of the language, the liberation of words from their true content, thereby creates a "theoretical" basis for the subjective-idealistic interpretation of phenomena, events occurring in nature and society, creates a "philosophical" basis for subjectively -idealistic interpretation and justification of the predatory imperialist policy of the US-British imperialists.

In his brilliant work "Marxism and the Questions of Linguistics", I. V. Stalin defeated pseudoscientific theories about language, defended and further developed the Marxist-Leninist science of linguistics, armed the communist parties, all progressive mankind with the doctrine of language, which is a powerful weapon in cognition and transformation the world.

Classics of Marxism-Leninism on practice as the basis of knowledge

The greatest world-historical merit of Marx and Engels lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of social thought they revealed the decisive role of socio-historical practice in the process of man's cognition of objective reality. Marx and Engels, and after them Lenin and Stalin, comprehensively developed the doctrine of social practice, which is the most important basis for achieving truth, i.e., discovering the true essence of objects and phenomena of the material world.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism for the first time established that our sensations, perceptions, ideas, as well as all the mental activity of people are inextricably linked with their practical activities, with experience, that the source and basis of the empirical and rational moments of all our knowledge is ultimately socio-historical, first of all industrial practice of people.

"We see," said Marx, "that the solution of theoretical opposites is possible only in a practical way, only thanks to the practical energy of man, and that therefore the solution of them is by no means a task of only knowledge, but a really vital task, which philosophy could not solve precisely because she saw in it only a theoretical task. (K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, vol. III, p. 628.)

Dialectical materialism proceeds from the fact that social production activity plays the most important, determining role in cognition. It is in the process of material production practice that a person cognizes the objects and phenomena of objective

reality, its laws, cognizes the relationship of a person to nature and people to each other.

Engels' proposition that labor created man himself applies entirely to the formation of his cognitive abilities. Man stood out from the world of other animals from the moment he began to produce means of subsistence, to create tools of production. Unlike animals, a person perceives the world not only in the process of biological adaptation to it, but mainly in the process of active practical influence on it. Engels pointed out that human thinking developed in proportion to how man learned to change nature. This active productive activity of ancient man, his struggle with the forces of nature determined the form of his thinking and were the first decisive moments that contributed to the knowledge of the reality surrounding him.

Man would not be able to actively influence nature, to subordinate its forces to his interests, if he did not know how to cognize the properties of things and the laws of development of the objective world. Therefore, the production of material goods is the most important factor in the development of human cognitive abilities. Expanding and improving the production process, involving in it an ever wider range of objects, a person inevitably improves his consciousness, and the developing consciousness, in turn, has a beneficial effect on the development of the production process. Engels wrote that by radically changing the surrounding reality in the process of material production, people at the same time also change their thinking. But "the development of the brain and the feelings subordinated to it, the more and more clearing consciousness,(Friedrich Engels. *Dialectic of Nature*, p. 136). Only in the process of repeated repetition of material

production operations over the centuries does a person acquire certain labor skills, fix them in the mind in the form of more or less stable ideas and concepts about things and phenomena of the objective world, acquire and develop the ability to correctly reflect the natural connections and relations of the objective world. The entire development of human cognitive abilities is closely connected with the development of production, with the progress of people's practical activities, because thanks to social revolutionary practice aimed at changing the world, a person enters into a comprehensive interaction and universal connection with things and phenomena of the objective world and not only remakes them, puts them at the service of his interests, but in the process of interacting with them he changes and develops comprehensively.

The production activity of people serves as the basis and necessary prerequisite for the emergence of new ideas, theories, new concepts, and ideas. Judgments about things and phenomena appear in the process of labor, in the process of social production.

"In order to understand," teaches V. I. Lenin, "it is necessary to empirically begin understanding, study, to rise from empiricism to the general. To learn how to swim, you have to get into the water." (V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 178.)

The regularities of phenomena, the qualities, and internal, hidden properties of things in the objective world, their connections and relationships can be more fully and deeply cognized and verified precisely in the process of people's labor production activity, in the process of a person's constant active influence on objective reality.

However, practice is not limited to production activities, but also includes all the diverse and versatile activities of people. It includes the developing scientific-experimental, social-revolutionary, social-domestic, cultural-educational, and other activities of people. It can act in the form of a natural-scientific experiment, observation, scientific and technical discoveries, in the form of class struggle, revolution, wars, etc. This allows socio-historical practice to become the basis of all natural and social sciences.

History shows that great scientific discoveries, like scientific knowledge in general, become possible and grow precisely out of continuously developing human practice and are determined by the vital, practical needs of people. Thus, the emergence and development of mathematics was originally caused by the needs of measuring areas, angles, volumes; the development of navigation gave rise to the science of astronomy; social sciences were generated by the desire of people to restructure the life of society; agrobiolgy emerged as a result of people's needs to increase agricultural productivity, etc.

Being the basis and reason for the emergence of new sciences, new branches of knowledge, the practical social production needs of society also cause the development, deepening and improvement of existing knowledge.

The vast majority of scientific discoveries were made after the social practice of man had developed accordingly, after life demanded this or that discovery. In a letter to Starkenburg, Engels wrote: "If, as you say, technology largely depends on the state of science, then science depends to a much greater extent on the state and needs of technology. If a society has a technical

need, then it advances science more than a dozen universities. (K. Marx, F. Engels. Selected works, vol. II, p. 484.)

When Galileo created the theory of the fall and motion of bodies, he did it not only in order to formulate the laws of the fall of bodies, the oscillations of pendulums, and the motion of metal projectiles, i.e., not from purely academic considerations. The need to discover these laws arose in the process of development of production, in particular the development of mining and artillery.

The invention of the steam engine by Polzunov, the invention of the radio by Popov, and other great discoveries were also dictated by the needs of social production, the needs of human practice.

This means that scientific theories and the need to solve certain problems arise in connection with the needs of practice and production. Therefore, science, if it is really a science, deals with the objectively existing material world, which is revealed to people in the course of their socio-historical activity. The main goal of science is the subordination of the forces of nature to the interests of people, the revolutionary transformation of reality. But this can be achieved only on the basis of knowledge of the laws of development of the objective world and, above all, the material basis of the life of society.

Convincingly proving that true science arises from the urgent practical needs of material production, that social practice directs scientific thought and often even outstrips science, K. A. Timiryazev wrote that "ordinary farmers, including our Moscow peasants, as court chronicles testify, in one complex issue ahead of science. By direct observation, they are

independently and long before science discovered the fact of the transition of rust from barberry to cereals - a fact, together with others like it, laid the foundation for the doctrine of the polymorphism of microscopic fungi, which the science of the fifties and sixties was so rightly proud of. (K. A. Timiryazev. Soch., vol. V, p. 66. Selkhozgiz. 1938.)

In our country, the practical tasks of developing socialist agriculture have been a tremendous stimulus for the development of theoretical questions of Michurin biology (the problem of the species, the question of intraspecific and interspecific relations of individuals, etc.). This, in turn, made it possible to solve in a new way such practical problems as breeding new varieties of cereals, fruits, new animal species, weed control, increasing productivity, the rapid planting of forest belts in the steppe regions, etc. "The close connection of science with Collective-farm and state-farm practice, says Academician Lysenko, "creates inexhaustible possibilities for the development of the theory itself for better and better knowledge of the nature of living bodies and soil."

All this fully applies not only to all the particular sciences, but also to philosophy. Rejecting the view that the driving force in the development of philosophy is the desire of people to achieve the so-called "pure thinking", Engels wrote:

"However, during this long period, from Descartes to Hegel and from Hobbes to Feuerbach, philosophers were not driven forward by the force of pure thought alone, as they imagined. Against. In fact, they were pushed forward mainly by the powerful, faster, and more rapid development of natural science and industry. (K. Marx, F. Engels. Selected works, vol. II, p. 352.)

This means that knowledge arises from the social production practice of people, and the growth of knowledge, in turn, contributes to the growth and improvement of social practice.

The enormous significance of practice as the initial starting point and the basis of knowledge can be especially clearly seen in examples from social life.

The scientific theory of the new communist society, created by Marx and Engels, was the result of a profound scientific analysis of the history of the development of human society, a critical revision of all previous knowledge, a generalization of the gigantic experience of the world revolutionary movement and, above all, the practice of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Without this generalization and the discovery on its basis of the real laws of social development, Marx and Engels could not have armed the international proletariat with a new, truly scientific theory, made a brilliant prediction about the advent of a new era in the development of human society - the era of communism.

In a new historical era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, having studied and generalized the practice of the revolutionary struggle of the working people of all countries, the latest experience of social development, having analyzed the essence of the economy of imperialism, further developed all aspects of the teachings of Marx, Engels, armed the international proletariat with an invincible fighting ideological weapon in its struggle against capital, for the triumph of socialism.

V. I. Lenin discovered the law of uneven development of capitalism and created on its basis the theory of the possibility

of the victory of socialism in one country, precisely because he deeply revealed and analyzed all the contradictions of imperialism - the last, decaying stage in the development of capitalism, when capitalist oppression is especially intensified, when The indignation of the masses against capitalism is growing with particular force, and there is a rapid growth of revolutionary forces within the capitalist countries. V. I. Lenin further showed that the uneven development of capitalism under imperialism leads to an aggravation of the revolutionary crisis in the colonial and dependent countries, gives rise to an intensification of the struggle for markets for goods and the export of capital, for colonies, for sources of raw materials.

As a result of the uneven development of capitalism, imperialist wars take place, which weaken the forces of imperialism and make it possible for imperialism to break through where it is weakest. "Based on all this, Lenin came to the conclusion that it is quite possible for the proletariat to break through the imperialist front somewhere in one place or in several places, that the victory of socialism is possible initially in several countries or even in one country taken separately, that the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries, due to the uneven development of capitalism in these countries, it is impossible ... " (History of the CPSU (b). A short course, p. 162.). A deep analysis of the mode of production of modern capitalism, the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat in the period of imperialism, was the main basis that led Lenin to this brilliant discovery.

In the well-known article "Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party," Comrade Stalin wrote that genuine Marxist-Leninists draw directives and instructions not from historical analogies, but from parallels, but from the study

of the surrounding conditions. In their work, they rely not on quotes and sayings, but on practical experience. (See I. Stalin. About Lenin, p. 6. Gospolitizdat. 1951.)

Developing further Lenin's teaching on the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country, generalizing the practice of creating a new mode of production, JV Stalin developed a doctrine on specific ways of building socialism in the USSR.

The successful implementation by the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, of the Leninist-Stalinist plan for building socialism in our country is clear proof of the vitality and strength of Marxist-Leninist science.

Having discovered the fundamental law of socialism and summarizing the experience of building socialism in our country, I. V. Stalin, in his brilliant work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," outlined the paths for building communism in the Soviet Union, thereby enriching Marxism-Leninism with new propositions, generalizations, conclusions, raising it to a new, even higher level.

The whole multifaceted, versatile activity of Comrade Stalin is a brilliant example of how one should study and generalize the latest achievements of science and revolutionary practice, how one should use them in one's daily practical activity.

"AND. V. Stalin knows how no one can generalize the revolutionary, creative experience of the masses, pick up and develop their initiative, learn from the masses, and teach the masses, lead them forward to victory. (Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Brief biography, p. 238.)

Comrade Stalin's work "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" is a brilliant example of the creative study and scientific generalization of the latest practice. It was thanks to the study and generalization of the practical activities of the working people of the USSR and the countries of people's democracy in reorganizing public life, the practice of the world revolutionary movement, that Comrade Stalin in this work advanced Marxist-Leninist political economy, creatively developed the most important questions of dialectical and historical materialism, enriched Marxism-Leninism new discoveries and conclusions about the basic preliminary conditions for the transition from socialism to communism, about the dialectics of the development of productive forces and production relations, about the elimination of essential differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, about the objective nature of the laws of science, as well as many other questions of dialectical and historical materialism.

All this suggests that social practice in its entirety plays an exceptional role in achieving the truth. It permeates the entire process of cognition, constituting its true basis.

At the same time, the gigantic practical measures for the progressive reorganization of nature and human society, carried out by the Soviet people on the basis of the open laws of science, are a mortal blow to agnosticism. They show that man is not only capable of knowing the objective laws of reality, but also of using them to change natural conditions, to revolutionize social life.

The Objective Character of Truth

The question of the existence of objective truth is closely connected with the solution of the fundamental question of philosophy, the relation of thought to being, and has always occupied a central place in the centuries-old struggle between materialism and idealism in the field of the theory of knowledge. It was the question of the existence of objective truth that was the watershed in the theory of knowledge, which divided philosophers into two camps - the camp of materialism and the camp of idealism.

Proceeding from the recognition of the primacy of spirit, consciousness, idealists of all varieties consider the world either as the embodiment of the "absolute idea", "world spirit", consciousness (objective idealism), or consider the world to be a product of the consciousness of individual people (subjective idealism). For idealists, only consciousness really exists, and the material world, being, nature exists only in our sensations, ideas, concepts. From the point of view of the idealists, we perceive not really existing objects, but only our sensations of these objects. So thought subjective idealists like Berkeley, Mach and Avenarius, for whom the whole world is a complex of sensations. So thought Kant, who assured that people can only know their own subjective representations, and the true essence of objects ("thing in itself") is fundamentally unknowable.

In contrast to this, Marxist philosophical materialism proceeds from the fact that all our perceptions, ideas, concepts, all our knowledge are images of objects and phenomena of the external world, that the objective world, matter, nature is the only source of sensations, consciousness, thinking, and

therefore not consciousness. man, it was not his mental activity that gave rise to the external world, as the idealists assure, but, on the contrary, our consciousness, thinking are the essence of a reflection of objects and phenomena of the material world. Thinking itself is a product, a property of highly organized matter - the brain.

Only the external, objective world is capable of evoking in us sensations, ideas, concepts. No knowledge is possible without the impact of the objects of the material world on our consciousness. "...Our ideas, our "I," wrote I. V. Stalin,

"exists only insofar as there are external conditions that cause impressions in our "I". Anyone who thoughtlessly says that nothing exists but our ideas is forced to deny any external conditions whatsoever and, therefore, to deny the existence of other people, allowing the existence of only one's "I", which is absurd and fundamentally contradicts the foundations of science. ". (I.V. Stalin. Works, vol. 1, pp. 318-319.)

Only due to the influence of real objects and phenomena on the sense organs can their images arise in our head in the form of sensations, ideas, etc. The theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, Lenin teaches, is based on the recognition of the external world and its reflection in the human head.

But if the material world exists objectively, i.e. outside of us and independently of us, then its true reflection in the human mind, i.e. our true knowledge of objects and phenomena of the real world, are also objective. Exposing the agnosticism and subjectivism of the Machists, V. I. Lenin proved that human ideas certainly have in themselves "a content that does not

depend on the subject, does not depend either on man or on humanity ...". (V. I. Lenin and n. Soch., v. 14, p. 110) . Dialectical materialism calls such knowledge of people about the external world objective truth.

Take, for example, the law of universal gravitation. This law operates in nature not because Newton discovered it, and not since it was discovered. Every law of nature or society exists and operates regardless of whether people know about it or not. There was a time when people believed that the sun revolves around the earth, that the earth has the shape of a flat disk, etc. However, this did not stop the earth from revolving around the sun and having an approximately spherical shape.

But in order for a person to take into account the laws of nature in his practical activity, to use them in the interests of people, he must discover these laws, formulate them, that is, reflect in his mind the presence of these laws in nature. The correct reflection in the mind of a person of objectively existing objects, phenomena, their connections, patterns is the objective truth.

A striking example of objective truth and its use in the interests of people is the Marxist doctrine of the laws of development of human society. Relying on these objectively true laws, Marx and Engels not only scientifically proved the inevitability of the advent of the era of communism, but also ingeniously outlined the main contours of this new social system.

The practice of building socialism and communism in our country, as well as socialist construction in the people's democracies, has brilliantly confirmed the objective character of this doctrine and the truth of its fundamental principles.

Thus, dialectical materialism considers such a truth to be objective, which is a true reflection of phenomena, objects, processes of the material world. And this means that every true proposition, every truly scientific theory, is by its nature an objective truth.

“To consider our sensations as images of the external world,” Lenin teaches, “to recognize objective truth, to stand on the point of view of the materialistic theory of knowledge, is one and the same thing.” (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 117.)

The recognition by dialectical materialism of the objective character of all truly scientific knowledge has always evoked attacks and impotent malice from bourgeois idealist philosophers. Expressing the interests of the reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie, they seek to distort objective truth in order to hide from the people the objective course of the development of history, disguise the true laws of its development, and declare unknowable phenomena of nature and social life. To this end, they distort the very concept of objectivity. For them, everything that serves the interests of predatory American imperialism, which is useful to Wall Street businessmen, which ensures "practical success" is objective. “

If religious ideas,” one of the leaders of modern American-English pragmatism, W. James, declares with cynical frankness, “fulfill these conditions, if, in particular, it turns out that that the concept of God satisfies them, then on what basis will pragmatism deny the existence of God? For him, it would be simply nonsense to recognize as "untrue" a concept that is so fruitful in a pragmatic sense.

Another representative of modern reactionary bourgeois philosophy, D. Dewey, denies the objective nature of truth on the grounds that the world around us allegedly does not exist by itself, but is formed, created by human consciousness. All modern bourgeois idealistic philosophy is stuffed with such anti-scientific "revelations".

It should be noted that some of our comrades, instead of waging the most ruthless struggle against the idealistic denial of the objective nature of truths, often themselves fall into the thrall of this anti-scientific theory. Mistakes of this kind were exposed by Comrade Stalin in his brilliant work *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

Revealing the nature and operation of economic laws, Comrade Stalin in this work showed the subjective-idealistic essence of the denial by some of our economists and philosophers of the objective nature of the laws of science, the laws of political economy under socialism. Blinded by the gigantic successes of the Soviet Union in transforming nature and human society, in successfully building a communist society in our country, these comrades decided that, in view of the special historical role of the Soviet state, its leaders could abolish the existing laws of political economy, could "form", "create new laws. So, for example, Sanina and Venzher argued that the economic laws of socialism arise only through the conscious action of the Soviet people.

Comrade Stalin convincingly proved that such statements have nothing in common with Marxism and lead into the swamp of an anti-scientific idealistic worldview.

Defending and developing the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the objectivity of truth, in particular, the objective nature of the laws of science, I. V. Stalin writes:

“Marxism understands the laws of science, whether we are talking about the laws of natural science or the laws of political economy, as a reflection of objective processes that occur independently of the will of people. People can discover these laws, know them, study them, take them into account in their actions, use them in the interests of society, but they cannot change or cancel them. Moreover, they cannot form or create new laws of science.” (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR. p. 4. Gospolitizdat. 1952.)

But the objective nature of the laws of science, teaches I. V. Stalin, their reflection of processes occurring independently of the will and desire of people, does not mean at all that people are powerless to prevent the results of the actions of the laws of nature, the results of the actions of the forces of nature. The destructive actions of the forces of nature do not always and everywhere occur with a spontaneous, inexorable force that is not amenable to the influence of people. “If we exclude,” I. V. Stalin points out, “astronomical, geological and some other similar processes, where people, even if they know the laws of their development, are really powerless to influence them, then in many other cases people are far from powerless in the sense of the possibility of their influence on the processes of nature. In all such cases, people, knowing the laws of nature, considering them, and relying on them, skillfully applying, and using them, can limit the scope of their action, (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, p. 4.)

To illustrate this position, I. V. Stalin gives an example of river flooding. In ancient times, when people did not know how to build dams and hydroelectric stations, river flooding caused great trouble to people. Being powerless to fight floods, people lost their homes, crops, etc. But with the development of science and human practice, people not only got the opportunity to avert flood disasters that previously seemed inevitable from society, but "learned to curb the destructive forces of nature, so to speak, to saddle them turn the power of water for the benefit of society and use it to irrigate fields, to generate energy. (Ibid., p. 5) . It was not for nothing that Lenin pointed out that "the laws of the external world, of nature ... are the basis of the purposeful activity of man." (V. I. Len and N. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 161.)

It is true that people in the countries of imperialism sometimes have to go through similar natural disasters even at the present time. So, for example, quite recently a storm broke out in the North Sea region, causing flooding in Holland and England. As a result of the flood, thousands of people died or went missing, more than a million people were left homeless; caused a huge financial loss. However, such destructive consequences of natural forces take place in the capitalist countries not because people are powerless to fight against the elements, but to a large extent because the reactionary rulers of these countries are not concerned about the fate of their peoples, but about preparing for a new predatory war.

The entire history of the development of human society shows that people are able to "bridle" nature, are able to prevent the destructive actions of some laws of nature, but not by violating, changing, or destroying the laws of nature, but, on the

contrary, on the exact basis of knowledge of the laws of nature, the laws of science.

This applies not only to the laws of nature, but equally to the laws of social development, in particular to economic laws, which are also objective laws, because they reflect economic processes that occur independently of the will of people. The task of science is not to destroy the laws of nature or society and replace them with other laws at the will of people. It is impossible to do this, because "it would lead," I. V. Stalin points out, "that we would fall into the realm of chaos and accidents, we would find ourselves in slavish dependence on these accidents, we would deprive ourselves of the possibility not only that to understand, but simply to understand this chaos of accidents. (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, p. 85.)

The task of science is to cognize, discover objective laws and use them in the interests of the revolutionary transformation of reality.

On Absolute and Relative Truth

Exposing the falsifier of Marxism, Machist Bogdanov, who slanderously asserted that "Marxism contains the denial of the unconditional objectivity of any truth, the denial of all eternal truths," V. I. Lenin wrote:

"Two questions are obviously confused here: 1) is there an objective truth, i.e., can there be such a content in human ideas that does not depend on the subject, does not depend either on man or on humanity? 2) If so, can human representations expressing objective truth express it at once, entirely, unconditionally, absolutely, or only approximately, relatively? This second question is the question of the relationship between absolute and relative truth. (V. I. Lenin and n. Soch., v. 14, p. 110.)

Idealists answer the first question in the negative. They categorically reject the objective character of any truth whatsoever, but by denying objective truth, they inevitably come to the denial of absolute truth as well.

What is absolute truth?

Absolute truth is such a truth that fully, exhaustively, quite adequately reflects in the mind of a person this or that phenomenon, object, this or that regularity of the objectively existing material world and, therefore, can never be refuted.

Dialectical materialism teaches that the cognition of absolute truth is an endless process, that, while cognizing objects, phenomena, laws of the objective world, a person cannot comprehend absolute truth at once, entirely, unconditionally,

finally, but reveals it, masters it gradually, approximately, relatively.

While recognizing objective truth as basically a correct reflection of the phenomena of the material world in people's minds, dialectical materialism by no means considers it a finished, unchanging, frozen truth. But being objective, truly scientific knowledge always contains, to a greater or lesser extent, grains, parts, particles of absolute truth, because knowledge is a historical process, as a result of which our knowledge about a subject more and more accurately reflects the content of this subject. Genuine truth always contains aspects, moments that do not depend either on man or on humanity.

Therefore, people's knowledge consists mainly of relative truths, i.e., such provisions, theories, concepts that basically correctly reflect the phenomena of objective reality, but in the process of development of science and social practice they are continuously refined, concretized, deepened and, as a result, constitute a moment side, a step on the way to mastering the absolute truth.

“Man,” V. I. Lenin points out, “cannot embrace = reflect = display the nature of all, completely, its “immediate wholeness”, he can only eternally approach this, creating abstractions, concepts, laws, a scientific picture of the world, etc. etc. etc.” (V. I. Lenin. Philosophical notebooks, p. 157.)

The entire history of the development of scientific knowledge from ancient times to the present day irrefutably proves this most important proposition of dialectical materialism. The

history of the development of any branch of science shows that in the process of social and labor and, above all, production activities, people move from ignorance to knowledge, from error to truth, from incomplete knowledge to more complete knowledge.

Let us take as an example the doctrine of the atomistic structure of the world. It is known what huge changes, corrections, and additions this doctrine has undergone over the millennia, starting from the ancient Greek materialist philosopher Democritus to the present day. Democritus, like his followers, believed that all objects are composed of atoms - indivisible material particles. All atoms, according to Democritus, are qualitatively the same and differ only in shape, arrangement, and position in space. The atomistic theory of Democritus contained a particle of absolute truth, contained in the very idea of the atomistic structure of the world. But in this theory there was much that was naive, incorrect, and erroneous (for example, the indivisibility of the atom, its immutability, indestructibility, the qualitative homogeneity of atoms, etc.).

With the development of science and scientific knowledge, this theory has been continuously developed and improved. Scientists have proven that an atom is a complex system consisting of electrons and a nucleus, which in turn consists of protons. Further, it was found that in addition to these particles, the composition of the atom also includes such elementary particles as the neutron, positron, mesotron, and others. At present, a hypothesis has been put forward about the existence of a new elementary particle inside the atom - the neutrino. There is no doubt that in the process of a deeper knowledge of the laws of the objective world, our knowledge of the atom will

be subject to further changes and refinements, and at the same time, our ideas about the atom will inevitably change.

And this happens in any science, in any branch of knowledge.

Marxist-Leninist science is also continuously developing, supplementing, and enriching itself. Marx and Engels created the general principles of this science, discovered the most general laws of the development of nature, human society and thought. Under the new historical conditions, Lenin, and Stalin creatively developed Marxism, enriched it with new discoveries and conclusions, concretized and deepened its most important propositions, and replaced the obsolete formulas of Marxism with new formulas corresponding to the new historical conditions.

Any science contains theories and provisions that reflect aspects, moments, laws of objective reality, and do not reflect them immediately, not entirely, not absolutely, but gradually, partially, relatively. With the development of science and social practice, the moments of relativity in our knowledge are increasingly decreasing, however, never completely disappearing, and the grains of absolute truth in them are continuously increasing. Each new scientific discovery, each moment of refinement and correction of our knowledge is a step, a stage, a step on the way to a more complete knowledge of the patterns of development of the material world, on the way to the knowledge of absolute truth.

“In the theory of knowledge,” teaches V. I. Lenin, “as in all other areas of science, one should reason dialectically, that is, not assume our knowledge is ready and unchanged, but analyze how knowledge comes from ignorance, how

incomplete, inaccurate knowledge becomes more complete and more accurate. (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 91.)

The Marxist thesis about the endless process of cognition, about the approach of man to the attainment of absolute truth, not only radically differs from the pseudo-scientific reactionary assertion of the idealists about the unknowability of the world, but is directly opposite to it. If agnosticism, which in one form or another is shared by all idealists, asserts that the objects and phenomena surrounding us are fundamentally unknowable, that man is powerless at any time to penetrate the secrets of the laws of development of nature, and even more so of human society, then dialectical materialism proceeds from the fact that the world is cognizable by its nature, that in the world there are no such objects and phenomena that a person could not know. There are no unknowable objects and phenomena, but only such objects and phenomena that are not yet known, but in due time they will certainly be revealed and known by the forces of developing science and social practice.

Thus, a contradiction is obtained: on the one hand, the world is knowable, there are no objects and phenomena that are fundamentally unknowable, and on the other hand, the world cannot be known completely, absolutely. But this is not a logical contradiction that arises as a result of the fact that a person thinks inconsistently, contrary to elementary laws and forms of thinking, but a dialectical contradiction inherent in reality itself.

Answering the question: is human thinking sovereign, i.e., is it capable of knowing the world to the end, Engels gives an exhaustive explanation of how this contradiction is resolved. "This contradiction," Engels points out, "can be resolved only

in an endless progressive movement, in such a series of successive human generations, which, for us at least, is in practice endlessly. In this sense, human thought is as sovereign as it is non-sovereign, and its ability to know is as unlimited as it is limited. Sovereign and unlimited in nature, vocation, opportunity, historical ultimate goal; non-sovereign and limited in terms of individual implementation, in terms of reality given at one time or another. (Friedrich Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 81-82.)

Consequently, this contradiction is resolved only as a result of the cognition of the objective world by many billions of past, present and future generations of people, i.e., in practice, the process of cognition will be carried out endlessly. At present, humanity has come a long way in its development, but, as Engels pointed out, “we, in all likelihood, are still standing at about the very beginning of human history, and the generations that will have to correct us will, presumably, be much more numerous. those generations whose knowledge we are now ready to correct, treating them very often from above. (Ibid., p. 81.)

The material world is inexhaustible, it is infinite both in space and in time, it is constantly evolving and changing. In this eternal, endless development of the material world, there is an ongoing process of the death of the old and the birth of the new, the disappearance of obsolete phenomena and the appearance of newly emerging ones. But since the process of the emergence of the new, the emerging is an endless process, then the knowledge of these new aspects of the material world is also an endless process.

Mankind practically cannot exhaust absolute truth, and its knowledge consists mainly of relative truths, historically transient, containing only grains, sides, moments of absolute truth.

The “essence” of things or “substance” is also relative, V. I. Lenin teaches, they express only the deepening of human knowledge of objects, and if yesterday this deepening did not go further than the atom, today it does not go further than the electron and ether, then dialectical materialism insists on the temporary, relative, approximate nature of all these milestones in the knowledge of nature by the progressive science of man. The electron is just as inexhaustible as the atom, nature is infinite...”. (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 249.)

This, however, does not mean that absolute truth is some kind of unattainable ideal, to which a person can only strive, but never achieve it. Dialectical materialism rejects such an agnostic approach to the question of absolute truth and believes that absolute truth is comprehended by us all the time. With its side, a particle, it enters into every truly scientific position, into every scientifically substantiated theory. But our knowledge also contains moments of relativity, for the inconsistency of the process of cognition lies precisely in the fact that human ideas, concepts, theories are a dialectical unity of the absolute and the relative, the objective and the subjective.

“So,” V. I. Lenin points out, “human thinking by its very nature is capable of giving and gives us absolute truth, which is made up of the sum of relative truths. Each stage in the development of science adds new grains to this sum of absolute truth, but the limits of the truth of each scientific position are relative, being

either expanded or narrowed by the further growth of knowledge. (Ibid., p. 122.)

But our movement towards absolute truth is accomplished not only by increasing grains, moments, sides of absolute truth in relative truths. There are also truths that absolutely accurately reflect this or that side of the objective world, and therefore do not need to be clarified, corrected, or added.

It is impossible, for example, to doubt the absolute truth of the proposition of materialistic dialectics that the world is in eternal and endless motion and development. This position is the absolute truth and does not need to be changed or corrected. But when we begin to concretize this general, absolutely true position, when we consider the question of the methods, forms, types of motion of matter, we immediately fall into the realm of relative truths, because specific forms and types of motion of a certain type of matter cannot be considered abstractly. Matter can take the most diverse forms and types of motion, depending on concrete historical conditions. One form or type of motion of matter is replaced under appropriate conditions by another form or type of its motion; under certain conditions, new types of motion of matter appear, which mankind is studying,

The relationship between absolute and relative truth was brilliantly expressed by V. I. Lenin:

“From the point of view of modern materialism, i.e. Marxism,” wrote V.I. Lenin, “the limits of the approximation of our knowledge to objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the existence of this truth is unconditional, it is unconditional that we

are approaching it. The contours of the picture are historically conditional, but what is certain is that this picture depicts an objectively existing model. It is historically conditional when and under what conditions we advanced in our knowledge of the essence of things to the discovery of alizarin in coal tar or to the discovery of electrons in the atom, but it is certain that each such discovery is a step forward of "unconditionally objective knowledge." In a word, any ideology is historically conditional, but what is certain is that any scientific ideology (unlike, for example, religious) corresponds to objective truth, absolute nature. (In I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 123.)

The essence of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the relationship between absolute and relative truth lies precisely in the fact that it considers relative truth as a moment, a part, a stage, a step in the cognition of absolute truth. Therefore, any truly scientific truth is at the same time both absolute truth, insofar as it basically correctly reflects a certain side of the objective world, and relative truth, insofar as it reflects this side of objective reality partially, incompletely, approximately.

Noting this dialectical character of the nature of truth and arguing with the enemies of Marxism, V. I. Lenin wrote:

"You will say: this distinction between relative and absolute truth is indefinite. I will answer you: it is just so "indefinite" as to prevent the transformation of science into dogma in the worst sense of the word, into something dead, frozen, ossified, but at the same time it is just so "definite" as to dissociate itself by the most resolute and irrevocably from fideism and agnosticism,

from philosophical idealism and from the sophistry of the followers of Hume and Kant. (Ibid.)

The recognition by dialectical materialism of the relative character of our knowledge has nothing in common with idealistic relativism. The reactionary essence of relativism is not that it recognizes the relative nature of all our knowledge, but that it does not recognize the objective nature of scientific knowledge, undermines faith in the cognitive abilities of human thinking, leads to a denial of the possibility of knowing the world around us and thus closes with agnosticism.

Not knowing and not wanting to know dialectics, relativists tear off, exaggerate, absolutize one of the aspects of knowledge - the relative nature of our knowledge. If our knowledge of natural phenomena changes over time, relativists reason, if even at the same time different people speak differently about the same subject, phenomenon, and there is some truth in the reasoning of both, then it is not better. Is it possible to “refrain from judgments”, is it not better to recognize all our knowledge about nature as fluid, impermanent, not containing even elements of absolute, objective truth. And if so, then we will never achieve true knowledge, and we are left to recognize that the real essence of things is unknowable. This is how relativists come to agnosticism, to idealism. Therefore, V. I. Lenin in his work “Materialism and Empirio-Criticism” wrote that “the principle of relativism, the relativity of our knowledge ... in case of ignorance of dialectics, inevitably leads to idealism. (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 295.)

The classics of Marxism-Leninism attached great importance to the struggle against relativism. They proved that relativists are essentially no different from subjective idealists, who reject

everything that is beyond the limits of subjective sensations and experiences and believe that all phenomena around us are nothing but a free and arbitrary creation of human consciousness.

But the denial of idealistic relativism by dialectical materialism, of course, does not mean a denial of relative truth in general. V. I. Lenin resolutely emphasizes that

"the materialistic dialectics of Marx and Engels certainly includes relativism, but is not reduced to it, that is, it recognizes the relativity of all our knowledge, not in the sense of denying objective truth, but in the sense of the historical conventionality of the limits of approximation our knowledge to this truth." (Ibid., p. 124.)

The profound, comprehensive criticism by Lenin and Stalin of idealistic relativism in cognition is of inestimable significance even today for the exposure of modern American-English bourgeois reactionary philosophy.

It is known that the most characteristic feature of all modern "isms" of reactionary bourgeois philosophy is agnosticism, mainly of a relativistic kind. For example, one of the most fashionable currents in modern American-English idealist philosophy, called positivism, is built on relativistic agnosticism. This current accepted and combined in itself all the most reactionary, most anti-scientific of the idealistic agnostic systems of the past, classifying them into special groups and awarding them with "self-contained" names like "logical analysis", "logical empiricism", "semantics", "pragmatism", "physicalism", and other no less

sophisticated "isms". They all pursue the same goal: to undermine people's faith in the ability of human thinking to know the world and remake it, to prove that science is powerless, point the way to a happy human society. Every progressive theory, every scientific position is declared by modern American-English philosophical obscurantists to be "pseudo-judgment", "pseudo-concept", which have a purely subjective, conditional, relative meaning and are allegedly completely devoid of objectivity.

The class-political meaning of all this pseudo-philosophical gibberish was brilliantly revealed by V. I. Lenin forty-five years ago. In his work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", V. I. Lenin wrote that "behind the epistemological scholasticism of Empirio-criticism one cannot fail to see the struggle of parties in philosophy, a struggle that in the last analysis expresses the tendencies and ideology of the hostile classes of modern society." (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 343). This Leninist conclusion applies in its entirety to all varieties of contemporary idealism.

The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the relationship between absolute and relative truth, with its edge, is directed not only against idealistic relativism, but also against the other extreme in the assessment of truth - against dogmatists, Talmudists, and dogmatists, who believe that all our knowledge consists of abstract, eternal, and unchanging truths.

Dogmatism in cognition means blind faith in old obsolete theories, unwillingness, and inability to modify and improve our knowledge, to bring it into line with new, continuously developing conditions.

Dogmatists and Talmudists are trying to squeeze new phenomena into old habitual positions and formulas that no longer correspond to new conditions. They believe that we must recognize every thought as either true for all times and for all occasions, or false. For them, there are no truths that are fair in some conditions and unfair in other conditions, therefore, in their reasoning, they operate mainly with bare abstractions and empty, meaningless analogies. Instead of a concrete historical analysis of the facts of reality, they artificially adjust the phenomena of nature and social life to general, stereotyped, "universal" truths.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism resolutely reject such a view of truth as a collection of complete dogmatic propositions that can only be memorized and applied to all cases of life. "... Truth now consisted in the very process of cognition," wrote Engels, "in the long historical development of science, rising from the lower levels of knowledge to ever higher ones, but never reaching such a point from which it, having found some so-called absolute truth, could no longer go further and where there would be nothing left for her, how, with folded hands, to contemplate this obtained absolute truth with amazement. (K. Marx and F Engels. Selected works, vol. II, p. 343.)

The theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism proceeds from the fact that abstract truths do not exist, truth is always concrete, and the concreteness of truth implies a comprehensive reflection of the world in thinking, a deep study of all aspects of a given object or phenomenon, taking into account the situation, place, and time.

“The totality of all aspects of a phenomenon, reality,” teaches V.I. Lenin, “and their (mutual) relations—this is what truth is made up of.” (V. I. Lenin. *Philosophical Notebooks*, p. 169.)

Not a single object, not a single phenomenon can be considered abstractly, outside the historically established conditions, place, and time, without taking into account its concrete historical place in a number of other objects, phenomena. The conditions themselves, Comrade Stalin teaches, are constantly changing, and therefore any proposition that is true in a given set of connections of an object, phenomenon, in given conditions of place and time, may turn out to be false and harmful in other conditions.

In the works “Marxism and Questions of Linguistics” and “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR”, as in his other works, Comrade Stalin waged a most ruthless struggle against all varieties of dogmatism, Talmudism, and dogmatism, which are especially dangerous when applied to the Marxist-Leninist science of society.

“Scholars and Talmudists,” writes Comrade Stalin, “consider Marxism, individual conclusions and formulas of Marxism, as a collection of dogmas that “never” change, despite changes in the conditions for the development of society. They think that if they memorize these conclusions and formulas and start quoting them at random, then they will be able to solve any problems, in the expectation that the conclusions and formulas learned by heart will be useful to them for all times and countries, for all occasions of life. But only people who see the letter of Marxism, but do not see its essence, who memorize the texts of the conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not

understand their content, can think like that. (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 54.)

By analyzing the mistake of A. Kholopov and using other examples, Comrade Stalin showed that Marxist-Leninist science is not a dogma, but a guide to action, that it is necessary not to memorize Marxist conclusions and formulas in a Talmudic way, but to understand their essence and creatively apply them to specific conditions, develop and to enrich Marxism-Leninism with new achievements of science and social practice.

Examples of the Talmudic approach on the part of some Soviet economists and philosophers to certain formulas and conclusions of Marxism, I. V. Stalin also cites in his work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR". Thus, for example, when examining the question of commodity production under socialism, I.V. Stalin points out that some comrades, referring to Engels' proposition that "once society takes possession of the means of production, commodity production will be eliminated, and at the same time and the dominance of products over producers," decided that the Party should eliminate commodity production as soon as it took power and nationalized the means of production in our country. They came to this profoundly erroneous conclusion precisely because they considered Engels' formula as pedantic, Talmudists, outside of space and time, without taking into account the specific conditions, place, and time of its application.

J. V. Stalin showed that Engels in his formula had in mind countries where capitalism and the concentration of production are sufficiently developed not only in industry, but also in

agriculture, and therefore there is the possibility of nationalizing and transferring to the public property all the means of production both in industry and agriculture. For such a case, Engels' formula is absolutely correct. But in the overwhelming majority of countries, including our country, agriculture was so fragmented between small and medium-sized owner-producers that it was not possible to raise the question of the expropriation of these producers. For such a case, Engels' formula is inapplicable.

Some would-be Marxists, seeking at all costs to show their non-Marxist thesis about the inexpediency of maintaining commodity production in our country, contrary to the Marxist-Leninist principle of the concreteness of truth, argue that commodity production under all conditions must lead and will certainly lead to capitalism.

Exposing this metaphysical, abstract proposition, V. Stalin, using a number of striking historical facts, proved that commodity production does not always and under all conditions lead to capitalism, but only in those cases when there is private ownership of the means of production and when labor power comes into play to the market as a commodity that the capitalist can buy and exploit in the process of production, i.e., in those cases where a system of exploitation of wage-workers by the capitalists exists in the country. In our country, however, where private ownership of the means of production, the system of hired labor, the system of exploitation no longer exist, commodity production cannot lead to capitalism.

"It is impossible to consider commodity production," teaches I. V. Stalin, "as something self-sufficient, independent of the

surrounding economic conditions.” (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, p. 15.)

This position of I. V. Stalin is of the greatest importance for the theory of knowledge. It teaches us to study each subject, each phenomenon deeply and comprehensively, taking into account the totality of their connection with other objects, phenomena, specific conditions, place, and time. Only such study can lead us to success and warn against mistakes.

The most important position of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge about the concreteness of truth is consistently carried out and developed in the works of I. V. Stalin. A striking example of this is JV Stalin's consideration of the question of the disintegration of the single world market and the deepening crisis of the world capitalist system.

It is known that in the spring of 1916, V. I. Lenin expressed the thesis that, despite the decay of capitalism, “on the whole, capitalism is growing immeasurably faster than before”; in the period before World War II, JV Stalin formulated the thesis about the relative stability of markets during the period of the general crisis of capitalism. Both these propositions of Lenin and Stalin were absolutely correct for their time.

However, at the present time, I. V. Stalin points out, the world market has disintegrated into two parallel world markets. As a result, “the sphere of application of the forces of the main capitalist countries (USA, England, France) to world resources will not expand, but will shrink, that the conditions of the world market for these countries will worsen, and the underutilization of enterprises in these countries will increase.” (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, pp. 31-

32). Therefore, in the new historical conditions, Comrade Stalin notes, these theses, which were valid for their time, have now lost their force.

This proposition of J. V. Stalin provides new vivid proof of the critical, revolutionary spirit of Marxist-Leninist teaching, which fights against inertia, conservatism, and stagnation in science, against the transformation of our knowledge into dead, canonized dogmas. "Science is therefore called science," I. V. Stalin points out, "because it does not recognize fetishes, is not afraid to raise a hand against the obsolete, old, and sensitively listens to the voice of experience, practice." (I. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 502.)

The greatest strength of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in the fact that it does not stand in one place, does not consider its individual formulas and conclusions as a collection of dogmatic propositions, but constantly changes, is replenished with new propositions, is enriched by the practice of the world revolutionary movement and, above all, by the richest experience in building communist society in our country.

"Marxism, as a science," writes I. V. Stalin in his work "Marxism and Questions of Linguistics," cannot stand in one place, it develops and improves. In its development, Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, new knowledge—consequently, its individual formulas and conclusions cannot but change with the passage of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and conclusions corresponding to new historical tasks. (I. Stalin. Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 55.)

Practice as a criterion of truth

In the history of the development of the theory of knowledge, the question of the criterion of truth has always occupied one of the central places. Determining the source, ways, ways of knowing the world around us, people inevitably posed the question: how to separate the true from the false, how to determine the reliability of our knowledge, their correspondence to those processes, phenomena, patterns that are objectively inherent in the real world?

It is quite understandable that the idealists could not give a correct answer to this question, because they incorrectly, anti-scientifically interpreted the essence of truth itself. For idealists, as we have seen, truth is something purely subjective, an arbitrary creation of human consciousness. The idealists reduce the whole process of cognition to purely mental activity of a person, reflecting, as a rule, the ideology, aspiration, and desire of reactionary, dying classes that are not interested in true knowledge of the world, idealists are afraid of reality, avoid testing their ideas with facts, social practice.

Before the emergence of Marxism, the question of a truly objective criterion of truth was not resolved, not only in idealist philosophy, but in essence even all pre-Marxist materialists could not find a complete scientific solution to this problem. All philosophers before Marx either completely ignored the role of practice as a criterion of truth, or reduced it to experience, experiment, observation, etc.

Only the classics of Marxism-Leninism for the first time in the history of the development of philosophy found a truly scientific solution to the question of the criterion of truth,

thereby making a revolutionary revolution in the theory of knowledge.

They proved that the social, labor, production activity of people is not only the basis of the entire process of cognition from its beginning to end, but also the decisive criterion of truth and the ultimate goal of cognition.

Proceeding from the materialistic solution of the basic question of philosophy, dialectical materialism teaches that truth is an adequate reflection of objective reality in the human mind, while the criterion of whether the human mind adequately reflects the external world is practice.

Only those ideas and theories that are confirmed in social practice can be recognized as a correct reflection of the objective world.

It should be noted that some idealists also recognized practice as the criterion of truth, but practice in their understanding is not the social revolutionary historical activity of people, but spiritual practice, i.e. human thinking (Kant, Hegel, etc.) or narrow vulgar practicality and businesslike (pragmatism is a reactionary idealistic trend in philosophy). This practice is purely subjective. It cannot determine which moments of our ideas are objective and which are subjective, which of them are inherent in objects of objective reality and which are introduced by us in the process of thinking. Practice, which is interpreted as a manifestation of the spirit, consciousness, and not as the real production and historical activity of people, inevitably leads to priesthood. It cannot objectively reflect reality, real life, because it is limited only to the abstract activity of consciousness. The idea here is the criterion of itself. Such an

understanding of the criterion of truth is anti-scientific, idealistic.

Ignoring the true material practice of people by idealists forces them to come up with such criteria of truth as "clarity" and "evidence" (Descartes), "internal coherence of thoughts" (Hume), "a priori significance" (Kant), "economy of thought" (Mach), "utility" (pragmatists), etc. What they have in common is the rejection of objective truth and the recognition of the so-called formal criterion of truth, which should reflect not objective reality, but correspondence between thoughts. This is especially vividly carried out in the philosophical system of Kant, neo-Kantians, and other idealists, for whom the forms of knowledge are pure abstractions that have nothing to do with objective reality, and all our knowledge should not be verified by comparison with things and phenomena of the objective world, with real facts, but by comparing theories with theories, ideas with ideas, thoughts with thoughts.

The position is called "true" not because it coincides with reality, which is on the other side of all thinking and everything conceivable, wrote the neo-Kantian Cassirer, but because in the process of thinking it proved itself in practice and led to new fruitful conclusions. Truth for neo-Kantians does not mean the correspondence of our ideas, theories, thoughts, to objective reality, but is derived from a priori abstract concepts in a purely logical way.

The assertions of the pragmatists are also an idealist twist. It is known that in their theory of knowledge, pragmatists rely on practice, on experience, which they understand as a set of human sensations and experiences. Truth, from the point of

view of pragmatism, is created by the person himself as a result of his volitional creative actions aimed at achieving the goal. All their knowledge is based on subjective interest. Practice, understood by them as mercantile entrepreneurial activity, is a criterion of truth insofar as it benefits the subject. "The value of truth," wrote the most prominent representative of pragmatism, the American reactionary philosopher James, "is the process of its evaluation, expressed in the usefulness of the cause."

Pragmatism has a lot in common with Machism. Mach, in his book *Knowledge and Error*, also argued that only success can separate knowledge from error. This blood relationship of pragmatism, Machism and solipsism (a kind of subjective idealism) was revealed by V. I. Lenin in his brilliant work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

Explaining and developing the main provisions of the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Knowledge can be biologically useful, useful in human practice, in preserving life, in preserving the species, only if it reflects an objective truth independent of man. For the materialist, the "success" of human practice proves the conformity of our ideas with the objective nature of the things we perceive. For the solipsist, "success" is all that I need in practice, which can be considered separately from the theory of knowledge. (V. I. Lenin. *Op.* vol. 14, p. 127.)

Pragmatism is the most reactionary idealist philosophy of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It calls not for actual knowledge of the objective world with the aim of changing it, but for adaptation to the existing reality; it calls for measuring truth only by utility. The same James in his book "Pragmatism" wrote: "Pragmatism

recognizes the truth (and this is its only criterion of truth) that "works best for us," i.e., for the capitalists. It is difficult to express more directly and frankly the essence of this ideology of predatory, bloodthirsty imperialism.

In contrast to all these tricks of the ideological servants of imperialism, dialectical materialism provides the only scientific solution to the question of the criterion of truth, proving that it is in practical socio-historical activity, in the process of production, that people are directly connected with the outside world, that the process of cognition and the process of testing knowledge the subordination of the forces of nature to the interests of mankind.

"Theoretical knowledge," wrote V.I. Lenin, "should give an object in its necessity, in its all-round relations, in its contradictory movement ... But the human concept "finally" grasps, captures, masters this objective truth of knowledge only when the concept becomes "being for itself" in the sense of practice. That is, the practice of man and mankind is a test, a criterion for the objectivity of knowledge. (V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, p. 183.)

The theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, developed by V. I. Lenin in his work "Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" and specified in the April Theses, at one time caused a furious howl among Russian and world opportunism. Rejecting this theory, they called it "delusional", supposedly capable of ruining the revolution. But life, practice, and the further course of the revolution brilliantly confirmed the correctness of Lenin's ideas.

We see the same thing in the natural sciences. The doctrine of the solar system, created by Copernicus, remained a hypothesis for three hundred years. And only when Leverrier, using this hypothesis, proved that there must be another, until then unknown planet, and even determined the place that it should occupy in heavenly space, when the astronomer Halle later actually discovered this planet, Copernicus' theory was proved.

Being an integral part and basis of the knowledge of nature and its management, practice makes it possible to separate the essential from the non-essential, the necessary from the accidental, the permanent from the transient; Practice helps a person to choose from the countless aspects of objective reality exactly those that he needs to fulfill the tasks assigned to him.

The socio-historical practice of a person, his production activity, being a criterion of truth, helps to expose outdated, obsolete theories, as well as reactionary, anti-scientific and erroneous ideas and views that hinder the progressive development of human society.

It is known, for example, that in science for a long time there was a "theory" according to which living matter has only a cellular structure. The Soviet biologist O. B. Lepeshinskaya refuted this erroneous point of view. Through a scientific experiment, O. B. Lepeshinskaya proved the existence of a living substance that does not have a cellular structure. She proved that in nature there is a constant process of formation of new cells from a structureless protein.

It was with the help of experiments and the practice of vegetative hybridization of plants that I. V. Michurin and T. D.

Lysenko irrefutably proved the anti-scientific content of the Morganist “chromosomal theory of heredity”.

Being a criterion of the truth of human concepts, theories, ideas about things and phenomena of the objective world, helping to reveal everything that is reactionary, fantastic, erroneous, practice at the same time introduces changes, corrections, additions into our knowledge about the world, determines the path for further development of theory. Life is always richer, more complex, more diverse than our ideas about it.

Life and practice brilliantly confirmed and proved the correctness of the teachings of Marx and Engels. In the new socio-historical conditions, V. I. Lenin, and J. V. Stalin in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions continued and creatively developed Marxism. An ingenious generalization of this new practice is, for example, the Leninist-Stalinist theories about the possibility of building socialism in one country taken separately, about socialist industrialization, about the collectivization of agriculture, the doctrine of the state under socialism and communism, about the paths of transition from socialism to communism, about general crisis of capitalism and many others.

Thus, life, socio-historical revolutionary practice helps to introduce changes, corrections, additions into our knowledge of the world, allows the Communist Party to creatively develop Marxist-Leninist theory.

Genuine science, if it really is a science, sees the strength and truthfulness of its theoretical propositions and conclusions in the fact that they are confirmed by practice. Therefore, in order

to test the truth of her theories, she invariably turns to practice, to experience, to the process of social production.

Recognizing practice as the basis of knowledge, dialectical materialism at the same time does not deny the relative independence, transforming and organizing role of advanced theory. At the same time, it also fights against overestimation, absolutization of theory, believing that in the inseparable unity of theory and practice, the latter always determines the former.

Dialectical materialism regards theory as a generalized social revolutionary practice.

"Theory," says Comrade Stalin, "is the experience of the labor movement of all countries, taken in its general form. Of course, theory becomes non-objective if it does not link up with revolutionary practice, just as practice becomes blind if it does not light its way with revolutionary theory. But theory can turn into the greatest force of the working-class movement if it develops in inseparable connection with revolutionary practice, for it, and only it, can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation and understanding of the inner connection of surrounding events, for it, and only it, can help practice to understand not only how and where the classes are moving in the present, but also how and where they should move in the near future. None other than Lenin said and repeated dozens of times the well-known proposition that:

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." (I. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 14.)

Therefore, theory and practice cannot be isolated from each other and considered independently.

The inseparable unity of theory and practice in Marxist-Leninist epistemology is determined primarily by the fact that the movement of knowledge does not end with the acquisition of reliable knowledge, verified by social practice. This is only half the problem. Marxist-Leninist philosophy believes that the task is not only to learn the patterns of development of nature and society and explain the world, but to use this knowledge to actively influence the world, to transform reality in practice in the interests of the working masses. "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways," wrote Marx, "but the point is to change it." (K. Marx, F. Engels. Selected works, vol. II. p. 385). The greatest organizing and transforming force of Marxist-Leninist theory lies precisely in the fact that it directs the practical activity of the proletariat, shows it the ways, and means of transforming reality, the way of building a new, communist society. However correct and good a theory may be, it will not matter if it is not used in revolutionary practice. Growing out of practice, all our knowledge must return to it not only to verify their truth, but also in order to illuminate and direct the process of revolutionary change in the world, the production, political and scientific activities of people.

"Through practice, discover truths," writes Mao Tse-tung, "and through practice, confirm truths and develop truths. From sensory cognition to actively move to rational cognition and, further, from rational cognition to active leadership of revolutionary practice, to the transformation of the subjective and objective world. Practice - knowledge, again practice - and again knowledge - this form in its cyclical repetition is endless, and the content of the cycles of practice and knowledge rises to

a higher level each time. Such is the whole theory of cognition of dialectical materialism, such is the view of dialectical materialism on the unity of knowledge and action. (Mao Tse-tung. Selected works, vol. I, p. 528. I. L. 1952.)

The ideological servants of modern American-British imperialism preach the theory of the unknowability of the world around us because they are afraid that the working classes will use the laws of science to radically transform nature and social life. In an effort to perpetuate capitalist slavery, to prove the inevitability and imminence of all the vices of the imperialist system, the ideologists of imperialism keep saying that people are powerless to change the capitalist social system, just as they are supposedly powerless to fight the elemental forces of nature.

In contrast to these conjectures, dialectical materialism has proved, and life, practice has fully confirmed, that people are not only capable of mastering the laws of development of the world around us, but also using them for the progressive transformation of reality. This was particularly convincingly proved by Comrade Stalin in his work *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. Using a number of simple and convincing examples, Comrade Stalin irrefutably proved "that people can discover laws, cognize them, master them, learn to apply them with full knowledge of the matter, use them in the interests of society and thus subdue them, achieve dominance over them." (I. Stalin. *Economic problems of socialism in the USSR*, p. 9.)

Comrade Stalin tirelessly teaches us that theory cannot develop successfully unless it is based on practice, unless every step is

verified by practice, just as practice is blind and helpless if it does not light its way with theory.

Directing the multifaceted and versatile activities of the world's first socialist state, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union comprehensively studies and generalizes the latest experience in the economic and political life of our country, strengthens the Soviet state, develops further Marxist-Leninist theory and on the basis of scientific knowledge of objective laws, skillfully implementing the unity of practice with revolutionary theory, leads us to a brighter future, to communism.

The greatest significance of the practical activity of people, aimed at transforming nature and society, at a radical change in the views and consciousness of people themselves, stands out especially brightly and convincingly in our time, in our country. Life itself, the practice of communist construction, the most progressive science in the world—dialectical materialism—help us to uncover and overcome everything that is old, obsolete, conservative, which hinders our progress, help us to expose anti-scientific reactionary ideas and theories, help us to quickly overcome the remnants of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people, contribute to the formation of a new, communist consciousness.

As early as 1908, the great Lenin wrote that the criterion of practice, i.e., the objective course of the development of history and, above all, the process of development of all capitalist countries, irrefutably showed that “following the path of Marx’s theory, we will approach objective truth more and more (never exhausting it); going along any other path, we cannot come to anything but confusion and lies. (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 130.)

The practice of our rapid advance towards communism once again confirms the correctness and vitality of the Marxist-Leninist theory, enriches it with new experience in the struggle and victories of the working people of the country of victorious socialism.

This richest experience of the revolutionary struggle of our people under the leadership of the Communist Party, as well as the experience of the class struggle of the world proletariat, was brilliantly summarized by Comrade Stalin.

The "Brief Biography of Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin" states that "Comrade Stalin gave a generalization of everything that Marx, Engels and Lenin contributed to the doctrine of the dialectical method and materialist theory, and further developed the doctrine of dialectical and historical materialism on the basis of the latest data of science and revolutionary practices." (Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Brief biography, p. 164.)

In his immortal works, and especially in his works "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism", "Marxism and Linguistics", "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", in his historical speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU, Comrade Stalin clearly showed the inseparable unity of science with life, the advanced revolutionary theory with practice, the inseparability and organic unity of the world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist party and its revolutionary practical activity. The Communist Party itself serves as a living embodiment of the organic internal unity of advanced Marxist-Leninist theory and revolutionary practice.

Pointing to this most important principle of Marxist-Leninist theory, Comrade Stalin wrote:

“This means that the connection between science and practical activity, the connection between theory and practice, their unity must become the guiding star of the party of the proletariat.” (I. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, p. 545.)

Significance of the Marxist-Leninist position on the cognizability of the world for the practical activities of the Communist Party

The Marxist-Leninist proposition on the cognizability of the world and its laws is of tremendous theoretical, political, and practical significance. Comrade Stalin points out that the extension of this proposition to the study of social life, to the study of the history of society, leads to extremely important conclusions for the practical activity of the party of the proletariat.

“If the world is cognizable,” writes Comrade Stalin, “and our knowledge of the laws of the development of nature is reliable knowledge that has the value of objective truth, then it follows that social life, the development of society, is also cognizable, and the data of science about the laws of the development of society, - are reliable data, having the value of objective truths. (Ibid. p. 544.)

Comrade Stalin drew this conclusion on the basis of a generalization of the entire history of the development of human society. He utterly smashes the fabrications of bourgeois scientists about the unknowability of social phenomena.

Contemporary bourgeois American-British philosophers and sociologists, in carrying out a stubborn and impudent struggle against historical materialism, insist on the impossibility of revealing any regularity whatsoever in social life, trying to prove the powerlessness of people to change the existing capitalist order in their countries.

The class essence of the struggle of the ideologists of imperialism against social science is frankly blurted out by the Italian fascist philosopher Croce. In his book *Politics and Morals*, he states that if we were to regard history as "an interweaving of forces acting outside of us and according to their own laws, then, along with their nightmarishness, we experience a feeling of helplessness, for there are no means to master these forces. and govern or regulate them as they are outside of us."

A sense of fear of the future, powerlessness in the face of the inexorable approach of the collapse of the imperialist system compels bourgeois politicians and their scientists to hide the laws of social development from the masses of the people, to divert their attention from actively influencing the process of progressive development of history.

The historical materialism created by the classics of Marxism-Leninism irrefutably testifies that "the science of the history of society, despite the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become as exact a science as, say, biology, capable of using the laws of development of society for practical application." (I. Stalin. *Questions of Leninism*, p. 544.)

The truth of the provisions of dialectical and historical materialism - the science of the general laws of the development of nature and society - is confirmed not only by the fact that it scientifically explains the social events of the past and present, but also by the fact that it makes it possible to foresee the further course of historical development, helps to penetrate into the future. The scientific prediction of Marx and Engels about the inevitability of the onset of a new, socialist era has been fully confirmed by life, the practice of socialist

construction in the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. And this is the clearest proof of the truth of the laws of social development discovered by them, proof that socialism has turned from a dream of a better future of mankind into a science.

"That means that in its practical activity," Comrade Stalin teaches, "the party of the proletariat must be guided not by any random motives, but by the laws of the development of society, by practical conclusions from these laws." (Ibid., pp. 544-515.)

Revealing the mistakes of some of our comrades who tried to prove that the Soviet state was supposedly capable of abolishing the laws of social development, the laws of political economy and creating new laws at its own discretion, Comrade Stalin in his work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" comprehensively proved that the revolutionary transformation of social life is the same as the conquest of the forces of nature, is possible only on the basis of a deep study and conscious application of the objective laws of science.

Therefore, the most important task of science is to discover the objective laws of the development of nature and society, tirelessly cognize these laws, gradually reveal one after another the secrets of the objective world and, relying on the open objective laws, taking them into account, give a different direction to the destructive actions of certain laws, limit their sphere of action, to give room to other objective laws that make their way. In other words, the task is to, relying on the discovered and known laws of nature and society, use them in the interests of society, in the interests of the revolutionary transformation of objective reality.

This proposition, which runs like a red thread through JV Stalin's entire work, *The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, is of exceptional importance for the theory of knowledge. It reveals and enriches one of the basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge about the inseparable unity of "advanced science and social practice. Knowledge is not for the sake of knowledge, not for the sake of curiosity, as the idealists assure, but in order to consciously apply the known laws in the interests of society, to subordinate them to the task of revolutionary reshaping of nature and social life.

The laws of social development, like the laws of nature, often act destructively. But as soon as a person discovers these laws, cognizes them, he gets the opportunity to control the actions of these laws, to use them in the interests of the progressive development of society.

"When modern productive forces," wrote Engels, "begin to be treated in accordance with their finally known nature, social anarchy in production will be replaced by socially planned regulation of production, calculated to satisfy the needs of both the whole society and each of its members." (Friedrich Engels. *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 263-264.)

The subsequent course of history, and above all the rich experience of Soviet socialist construction, brilliantly confirmed this most important indication of Engels.

That is why the great leaders of the proletariat, Lenin, and Stalin, proceeding from the new historical situation, tirelessly developed and enriched Marxist-Leninist science and mercilessly exposed its enemies.

It was the profound knowledge, all-round development, and creative application of the laws of social development to modern conditions that enabled Comrade Stalin in his work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" to comprehensively study the laws of social production and distribution of material goods in socialist society, to determine the scientific foundations for the development of a socialist economy, to indicate ways to build communist society, outlining three basic preconditions for preparing the transition to communism.

"It is necessary," said I. V. Stalin, "firstly, to ensure firmly ... the continuous growth of all social production with a predominant increase in the production of means of production. Preferential growth in the production of means of production is necessary not only because it must provide both its own enterprises and the enterprises of all other branches of the national economy with equipment, but also because without it is generally impossible to carry out expanded reproduction.

... It is necessary, secondly, through gradual transitions, carried out to the benefit of the collective farms and, consequently, for the whole of society, to raise collective farm property to the level of public property, and to replace commodity circulation, also through gradual transitions, with a system of product exchange, so that the central government or another any socio-economic center could cover all the products of social production in the interests of society.

... It is necessary, thirdly, to achieve such a cultural growth of society that would provide all members of society with the comprehensive development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to

receive an education sufficient to become active agents of social development, so that they had the opportunity to freely choose a profession, and not be chained for life, due to the existing division of labor, to one particular profession. (I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, pp. 66-67, 68-69.)

However, it should be noted that the fruitful use of the objective laws of nature and society discovered by science and, on this basis, the conscious control of objective processes is fully possible only in countries liberated from capitalist oppression.

Torn apart by internal and external contradictions, capitalism by its nature is not capable of fully using the already discovered objective laws, the achievements of modern science and technology, because the use of many scientific discoveries in the national economy is contrary to the interests of powerful monopoly associations. Monopolies artificially delay the use of many of the most important scientific discoveries and inventions.

The American trust General Motors, for example, uses only one percent of its patents for inventions, the rest of the patents are kept under wraps, so long as they are not used by other capitalists. This is because the goal of private capitalist associations is not to satisfy the needs of the population, but to produce goods for sale in order to extract maximum profit.

Only in our country, under the conditions of planned socialist production, have unprecedented opportunities opened up for the full and comprehensive use of the advanced achievements of scientific and technical thought in the interests of improving the material situation of the working people, for the essential features of the basic economic law of socialism, as Comrade

Stalin teaches, is to ensure maximum satisfaction at all times the growing material and cultural needs of the whole of society through the continuous development of socialist production on the basis of higher technology.

True knowledge and correct conscious use of the objective laws of science enable us to carry out gigantic measures not only for the transformation of nature, but also for the revolutionary restructuring of social life. The building of socialism and communism in our country has become possible only because we are armed with the most advanced Marxist-Leninist science of the objective laws of the development of human society.

The strength of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in the fact that they, being objective truths, allow us to correctly explain and comprehend the past and present, to foresee the course of the further development of nature and human society, and therefore serve as a powerful weapon for the practical transformation of objective reality.

Comrade Stalin vividly demonstrated the enormous importance of knowing and skillfully applying the laws of social development by the example of the law of the obligatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces. Pointing out the exceptional difficulty and complexity of the task that confronted the Soviet government in the matter of creating, in fact, "from scratch", new, socialist forms of economy, I. V. Stalin emphasizes that this task was honorably completed only because the Soviet government relied on the law of the obligatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces. Using this law, "Soviet power," I. V. Stalin points out, "socialized the means of production, made them the property

of the whole people, and thereby destroyed the system of exploitation, created socialist forms of economy.(I. Stalin. Economic problems of socialism in the USSR, p. 7.)

Profound knowledge and conscious use of the law of the obligatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces enables us to reveal in good time the growing contradictions between lagging production relations and the continuously developing productive forces of socialist society, to prevent these contradictions from turning into their opposites, and to take timely measures to overcome them by means of adaptation. production relations to the growth of productive forces.

Our Party and the Soviet state, armed with a deep knowledge of the laws of social development, the laws of development of socialist society, consciously and skillfully use them, constantly rely on them in their practical activities.

In his report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU, Comrade Malenkov points out that "the Party's plans for the future, which determine the prospects and ways of our advance, are based on knowledge of economic laws, are based on the science of building a communist society developed by Comrade Stalin." (G. Malenkov. Report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, p. 81. Pravda ed., 1952). It was precisely on the basis of these laws and, above all, on the basic economic law of socialism, on the law of the obligatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces, the law of planned (proportional) development, that the 19th Congress of our Party worked out directives for the five-year plan for the development of the USSR, which provides for a

powerful new upsurge of the entire socialist economy, and which is a new major step in the progressive movement of our society towards communism.

The greatest significance of true, correct knowledge of objective laws lies not only in the fact that it illuminates with powerful light the path to building a new, communist society, but also in the fact that it enables us to carry out gigantic measures for the transformation of nature. It is known that modern hydraulic structures are carried out on the basis of the latest achievements of science and social practice, on the basis of the most advanced achievements of technical thought.

On the other hand, the great successes of the Soviet people in the transformation of nature and social life are the most reliable and indisputable proof that we have correctly recognized the objective laws on the basis of which this transformation is carried out. V. I. Lenin teaches us that “domination over nature, which manifests itself in the practice of mankind, is the result of an objectively correct reflection in the head of a person of the phenomena and processes of nature, there is proof that this reflection (within the limits of what practice shows us) is objective, absolute, eternal truth. (V. I. Lenin. Works, vol. 14, p. 177.)

Therefore, the connection of theory with practice, the creative community of science and production, which is becoming ever larger in our country, are a powerful means of developing both science and the practical activity of people, helping us to carry out gigantic measures to transform nature and social life in the interests of millions of working people.

A brilliant example of the creative development of science on the basis of a generalization of the practical, revolutionary activity of the masses are the immortal works of the great thinker of our era, Comrade I. V. Stalin. Summarizing the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat, the practice of socialist construction in the USSR and the countries of people's democracy, Comrade Stalin in his works further developed Marxism-Leninism, enriched science, armed the communist parties and the working people of all countries with a profound knowledge of the laws of social development.

At the funeral meeting on the day of I. V. Stalin's funeral, Comrade Molotov pointed out that I. V. Stalin "constantly worked on the theoretical problems of building socialism in our country and on the problems of international development in general, illuminating the paths of further development of the USSR with the light of the science of Marxism-Leninism, the laws of development of socialism and capitalism in modern conditions. He has armed our Party and the entire Soviet people with new, most important discoveries of Marxist-Leninist science, which for many years will illuminate our progress towards the victory of socialism. (V. M. Molotov. Speech at a morning meeting on the day of the funeral of Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, pp. 9-10. Gospolitizdat. 1953.)

Relying on these great discoveries and consciously using them in practical activities, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are successfully building socialism. Relying on Marxist-Leninist science, on knowledge of the laws of the development of society, the Communist Parties of foreign countries are leading the victorious struggle of the working people for peace and democracy, for the triumph of socialism.



The entire development of human cognitive abilities is closely connected with the development of production, with the progress of people's practical activities, because thanks to social revolutionary practice aimed at changing the world, a person enters into a comprehensive interaction and universal connection with things and phenomena of the objective world and not only remakes them, puts them at the service of his interests, but in the process of interacting with them he changes and develops comprehensively.

No Copyrights

Creative Commons ShareAlike (CC BY-SA)

